

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of citizens of Utica, N. Y., favoring House bill 178—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of Adrian (Mich.) Federation of Labor, favoring the repeal of the desert-land and homestead commutation acts—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SNOOK: Resolutions of the Ohio Horse Breeders' Association and Ohio State board of agriculture, favoring House bill 16656, providing for the free importation of pure-bred live stock for breeding purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Ohio State board of agriculture, favoring a just and liberal appropriation for new buildings for the Agricultural Department—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of East Haven, Conn., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolutions of the Connecticut Lodge, No. 189, of New Haven, Conn., Order of B'rith Abraham, favoring a modification of the methods and practice of immigration officers at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STARK: Petitions of Ben L. Terry, Frank Harris, and others, of Ohio, Nebr., and vicinity, urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of Sunset and Abilene, Tex., urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Papers to accompany House bill for an increase of pension to Clark Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of Thomas P. Powell and other druggists of Vienna, Metropolis, Ills., and vicinity, for the enactment of House bill 178, for reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 20, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. FAIRBANKS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved. It is approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1115) for the relief of Francis S. Davidson, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Cavalry; and

A bill (S. 6216) to pay in part judgments rendered under an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Hawaii for property destroyed in suppressing the bubonic plague in said Territory in 1899 and 1900, and authorizing the Territory of Hawaii to issue bonds for the payment of the remaining claims.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15345) to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 9503) to authorize the Oklahoma and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Fort Sill Military Reservation, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 16604) making appropriation for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 216) extending the provision granting to the State of Pennsylvania the use of the court-house at Scranton and Williamsport, Pa.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the board of directors of the Slater Trust Company, of Pawtucket, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing national banks to issue asset currency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of the legislative board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called employers' liability bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Trades and Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of Kokomo, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to repeal the issuance of the

revenue-stamp tax on eighth kegs of beer; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Studebaker Brothers Manufacturing Company, of South Bend, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation which will insure a volume of currency in proportion to the demand and supply; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Studebaker Brothers Manufacturing Company, of South Bend, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the system of post-check currency; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the State Bureau of Child and Animal Protection of Denver, Colo., and a memorial of the Humane Society, of South Bend, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the interstate transportation of live stock; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 8785, of Bluffton; of Carpenters and Joiners' Union, No. 205, of Terre Haute, all of the American Federation of Labor, and of Good Will Lodge, No. 52, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Logansport, all of the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the so-called desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of Lodge No. 23, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-injunction and conspiracy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the National Drain Tile Company, of Terre Haute, Ind., and a petition of the Mohawk Cycle Company, of North Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the establishment of a department of commerce; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of Cedar Church, of the Society of Friends, of Farmland, Ind., and a petition of the Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Kokomo, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the bill to promote the efficiency of the militia so as to provide for an exemption clause based on conscientious scruples; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the National Association of Naval Veterans of Salem, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a pension to George K. Knowlton; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the American Bar Association of the United States, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a building for the use of the Supreme Court of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. QUAY. I present the petition of Red Horse, a Yankton Sioux Indian, and sundry other Indians, praying for the passage of the bill (S. 6598) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to correct errors where double allotments of land have erroneously been made, to correct errors in patents, and for other purposes. I move that the petition be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. I present a petition from a number of colored people in the State of Georgia, relative to the loss by them of money by the failure of the Freedman's Saving Bank and Trust Company, and praying for further legislation looking to their reimbursement in part. I do not know to what committee the petition belongs, but I ask that it may be appropriately referred, so that the matter may have due attention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Finance, who have that matter in charge.

Mr. BACON presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Brunswick, Ga., praying for the passage of the so-called pure-food bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of Columbia Council, No. 8, Daughters of Liberty, of Jersey City, N. J., and a petition of Essex Council, No. 161, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Newark, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorials of P. Leonard Rice, of Bridge-ton; of W. W. Ammerman, of Delaware; of E. L. Welling, of Atlantic Highlands; of J. B. Hammond, of Atlantic Highlands; of T. J. Todd, of Dunellen, of Mrs. M. Peal, of Bayonne; of W. W. Fry, of Trenton; of L. B. Parsells, of Gloster, and of T. C. Bodine, of Dunellen, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to repeal the present anticanteen law; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of Lodge No. 331, Order of B'rith Abraham, of St. Paul; of Lodge No. 119, Order of B'rith Abraham, of Minneapolis, and of Lodge No. 93, Order of B'rith

Abraham, of St. Paul, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to modify the methods and practice pursued by the immigration officers at the port of New York; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 294, of Duluth; of the Trades and Labor Council of Mankato; of the Trades and Labor Assembly of St. Paul; of Local Union No. 106, of Duluth, and of Local Union No. 23, of Minneapolis, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a memorial of the Humane Society of Burlington, Vt., and a memorial of the Humane Society of Springfield, Vt., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the interstate transportation of live stock; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Marble Workers' Local Union No. 23, of Brandon; of the Central Labor Union of Middlebury, and of Local Union No. 264, of Rutland, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Vermont, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Montana presented petitions of Bricklayers and Masons' International Union No. 1, of Butte; of Stationary Engineers' Local Union No. 83, of Butte; of the Miners' Local Union of Chestnut, and of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 744, of Red Lodge, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Montana, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Order of B'rith Abraham, Lodge No. 271, of Portland, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to modify the methods and practice pursued by the immigration officers at the port of New York; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Sunday School Association of Scarborough, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

#### OKLAHOMA AND INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. NELSON. I present a petition of the business committee of the Western Miami tribe of Indians of the Quapaw Agency, Ind. T., praying for the passage of House bill 12543 in such form as to provide for the creation of the Territories of Oklahoma and Indian Territory into a single State and to admit them into the Union at once. I ask that the petition may be read and referred to the Committee on Territories.

There being no objection, the petition was read, and referred to the Committee on Territories, as follows:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

We, the undersigned, business committee of the Western Miami tribe of Indians, of the Quapaw Agency, Ind. T., now assembled in council, do most respectfully petition your honorable assembly to pass the H. R. 12543, as reported to the Senate by Senator NELSON on the 3d day of December, A. D. 1902, providing for the creation of the Territories of Oklahoma and Indian Territory into a single State and admitting them into the Union at once. We and our people are bitterly opposed to any legislation providing for the admission of the Territory of Oklahoma as a State and the gradual absorption by it of the Indian Territory by piecemeal. We desire to have a voice in the adoption of a constitution and the enactment of laws which will govern us, perhaps, for generations to come. If it be the ultimate intention of your honorable assembly to merge the Indian Territory and Oklahoma into one sovereign State we earnestly petition you that it be done at one and the same time; or, if it be deemed most expedient to postpone the admission of the lands occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes into a State, we very earnestly petition you that the lands comprised within the limits of the Quapaw Indian Agency be formed into a county and be admitted as such into statehood with the Territory of Oklahoma.

Our people are for advancement in civilization, industry, and education, etc., and our Territory needs some laws relating to a public-school system, public roads, bridges, and laws regulating the running at large of live stock, and in a general way we need laws to better protect us in the enjoyment of our lives and property. We are anxious to make final settlement with the Government of the United States and become citizens, with all of the rights, privileges, and benefits incident thereto. We feel sure that it will be better for every person concerned, and for any data or particulars concerning our tribal affairs or the existing condition of our country we very heartily refer you to our faithful friend and adviser, Thomas F. Richardville, late principal chief of our tribe, and at present chairman of the business committee, the office of chief having been abolished by act of our council held on the 19th day of September, A. D. 1901, at the solicitation and upon the recommendation of said Thomas F. Richardville, late chief of our said tribe, and who has been so faithful and diligent and untiring in his efforts for the uplifting, advancement, and enlightenment of his people.

Trusting that the foregoing petition will receive your most careful and considerate attention, the same is very respectfully submitted.

G. W. LEONARD,  
C. W. RICHARDVILLE,  
HENRY LAFALIER,  
W. THEODORE DOLLAR,  
*Business Committee.*

Attest:

W. THEODORE DOLLAR, *Clerk.*  
THOMAS F. RICHARDVILLE, *Chairman.*

Witnesses:

L. L. MCNAMAN,  
M. B. POOLER.

#### GEN. WILLIAM F. SMITH.

Mr. PROCTOR. I present resolutions of the general assembly of the State of Vermont, praying that Gen. William F. Smith be commissioned a major-general in the Regular Army. I ask that the resolutions be read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Whereas there has recently been placed in our capitol at Montpelier a tablet with portrait medallion commemorative of the military fame and services of William Farrar Smith, brevet major-general, United States Army, which was presented to Vermont by soldiers from other States who admire so much her great soldier son.

This tablet bears, as a part of its inscription, the following extracts from a letter addressed to General Grant under date of December 31, 1863, by the Assistant Secretary of War, Charles A. Dana:

"The surest means of getting the rebels altogether out of East Tennessee is to be found in the Army of the Potomac. \* \* \* This naturally led to your second proposition, namely, that either Sherman or W. F. Smith be put in command of that army. \* \* \* Both the Secretary of War and General Halleck said: 'Gen. W. F. Smith would be the best person to try.' \* \* \* The President, the Secretary of War, and General Halleck agree with you in thinking that it would be on the whole much better to select him." \* \* \*

The verdict here recorded shows not only the opinion entertained by Lincoln, Grant, and Stanton in respect to General Smith's conspicuous soldierly abilities, but also serves most forcibly to direct attention to the neglect and indifference which of late years have been suffered to obscure the memory of his brilliant and patriotic services.

General Smith, now 78 years of age, is one of three or four corps commanders of the Union Army who still survive, and yet this brave old veteran, concerning whom General Grant in recommending his promotion to be a major-general, wrote: "He is possessed of the clearest military head in the Army; is very practical and industrious; no man in the service is better qualified than he is for our highest commands," is to-day on the retired list with no higher rank than that of a major of engineers. Therefore

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That it is the profound belief of the general assembly of the State of Vermont that the country owes it to its own reputation for justice and gratitude to make such reparation for past neglect as is now within its power, and to this end we respectfully urge that General Smith be commissioned a major-general in the Regular Army with the emoluments of a retired officer of that rank.

It is further resolved that a copy of this memorial and resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each House of Congress, and to each member of the Vermont delegation therein, and they are earnestly requested to use every honorable effort to secure the favorable action of Congress in respect thereto.

JOHN H. MERRIFIELD,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*  
ZED S. STANTON,  
*President of the Senate.*

#### STATE OF VERMONT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the joint resolution memorializing Congress in respect to the rank of Maj. Gen. William Farrar Smith, as appears by the files and records of this office.

Witness my signature and the seal of this office at Montpelier, this 18th day of November, 1902.

[SEAL.]

FREDERICK G. FLEETWOOD,  
*Secretary of State.*

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4530) for the relief of settlers on lands in Sherman County, in the State of Oregon, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,000 for the purchase of a marble bust of General Lafayette, by David D'Angers, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 136) authorizing the purchase of a marble bust of General Lafayette, executed by David D'Angers, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) to carry into effect two resolutions of the Continental Congress directing monuments to be erected to the memory of Generals Francis Nash and William Lee Davidson, of North Carolina, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5756) for the relief of the officers and crew of the United States steamer *Charleston*, lost in the Philippine Islands November 2, 1899, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BARD, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1270) granting to the State of California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9867) for the relief of the estate of Henry C. Nields, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6367) granting an increase of pension to



Edmund P. Fox, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6649) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DIETRICH. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 146) to extend the time for construction of the Akron, Sterling, and Northern Railroad, in Alaska, to report it without amendment, and submit a report thereon. The joint resolution has the unanimous indorsement of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

#### REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I ask for the consideration of the resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools for 1902, which was reported yesterday from the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution reported yesterday from the Committee on Printing, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print from stereotyped plates 1,000 additional copies of the Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools for 1902, for the use of the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BAILEY. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made to its consideration.

#### STATUE OF GEN. HENRY LEAVENWORTH.

Mr. HARRIS. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. R. 138) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for a life-sized statue of Gen. Henry Leavenworth, at Leavenworth, Kans., and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. PLATT of New York. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The joint resolution goes to the Calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 7036) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Daniels; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 7037) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Hammond; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 7038) to provide for an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the southern district of New York; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 7039) to correct the military record of Allen F. Godwin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7040) granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Poundstone (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7041) granting an increase of pension to William R. Lawrence (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7042) granting an increase of pension to James M. Roszell (with the accompanying papers).

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 7043) to establish a light-house depot for the Second light-house district, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7044) to authorize the President to detail officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service as superintendents or instructors in the public marine schools; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7045) granting an increase of pension to Augustus J. Norwood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7046) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Maccarty; which was read twice by its title, and referred to Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 7047) to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in

the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 7048) granting a pension to Mary A. Curnutt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 7049) for the relief of the creditors of the Deposit Savings Association, of Mobile, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 7050) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Meek; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 7051) to extend the limit of cost for the United States post-office building at Marblehead, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 7052) granting an increase of pension to George Peno; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. NELSON submitted two amendments, one proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Odessa, Russia, and the other proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Amsterdam, Netherlands, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HALE subsequently said: I wish to correct the reference just made, by which certain amendments touching consular offices and increasing salaries were referred to the Committee on Commerce. The amendments ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to be by them reported as amendments to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill if they receive favorable action.

Mr. NELSON. The amendments relate to consuls only and should go to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HALE. No.

Mr. NELSON. The Committee on Commerce has jurisdiction over consular appointments.

Mr. HALE. But not over their salaries.

Mr. NELSON. But not over their salaries.

Mr. CULLOM. All such bills come from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON. Let the amendments go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE. Let them go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, that they may report them as amendments to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General to \$5,000, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of War to establish a permanent camp ground for the instruction and maneuvering of troops of the Regular Army and National Guard in the vicinity of Fort Sam Houston, in the State of Texas, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the first assistant in the document room of the Senate from \$1,800 to \$2,000, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the reconstruction and completion of the old Providence Hospital building, in the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also submitted an amendment directing the issuance of patents in fee, severally, to certain Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians for land heretofore allotted to them in the Territory of Oklahoma, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for grading and macadamizing Grant street,

between Eighteenth and Nineteenth streets, in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing for the establishment of a nurse corps of trained women nurses for the United States Navy, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment relative to the charter of Army transports belonging to the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Army, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOAR submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for the purchase and preservation of the battlefield of Balls Bluff, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CULLOM submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,500 for the salary of secretary of legation at Switzerland, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

#### POWER OF PRESIDENT TO NEGOTIATE TREATIES.

Mr. CLAY. In the Forty-eighth Congress, second session, Mr. Tucker, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, made a very valuable report on the power of the President to negotiate treaties with foreign governments. The copies of that report have been practically exhausted. It is of importance, and on a subject which is now before the Senate to be discussed, and I ask that the report be printed as a document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks that a certain paper be printed as a document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

#### SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS IN MAINE.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following resolution; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

*Resolved by the Senate,* That the Postmaster-General be, and hereby is, directed to report to the Senate the amounts of salaries of all postmasters in the State of Maine, for the terms of service specified, whose names and terms of service appear on the schedule of such cases in said State hereto attached, adjusted under the act of 1854, and the amount of the salary of each such postmaster adjusted and paid under the act of 1884, so that the difference between the salary paid and the amount of salary ordered paid by the act of 1883 shall appear in each case specified on the said schedule.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 9503) to authorize the Oklahoma and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Fort Sill Military Reservation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 16604) making appropriation for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 216) extending the provision granting to the State of Pennsylvania the use of the court-house at Scranton and Williamsport, Pa., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ANTHRACITE COAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. VEST on the 5th instant, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Finance be instructed to prepare and report a bill amending "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897, so that the tariff duty shall be removed from anthracite coal and the same be placed on the free list.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] is not in his seat. I hope that the resolution may be laid aside without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the resolution may lie on the table, holding its place. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PRODUCTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. LODGE, as follows:

*Resolved,* First, that the Committee on Finance be instructed to inquire and report to the Senate whether any, and if so what, countries discriminate

against any article or articles the growth or product of the soil or industry of the United States by levying upon such article or articles duties, imposts, excises, or taxes in excess of those levied upon similar articles imported from other countries, or, further, in any way fail to admit the products of the United States on terms as favorable as those accorded to any other nation.

Second, that if it should appear that any country or countries discriminate against the United States in the manner aforesaid the Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate whether it is not advisable that a suitable law should be enacted by which maximum and minimum rates of duty shall be established in such manner as to give preference and advantage in rates of duty to the products of those countries which do not discriminate against the products of the soil or industry of the United States, but admit them on an exact equality with similar articles the products of other countries and on the terms and at the rates of duty accorded to the most favored nation.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the resolution may lie on the table. I do not ask that it be given any particular place, but I ask that it may lie on the table until I can have an opportunity to call it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks that the resolution may lie on the table, subject to his call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 16021) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read, and that the amendments proposed by the committee may be considered as the reading progresses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments shall first receive consideration. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 2, line 6, to increase the appropriation for the salary of telegraph operator in the office of the Vice-President from \$1,400 to \$1,500, and in line 8, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the Vice-President from \$5,660 to \$5,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the items for the office of Secretary, on page 3, line 5, after the word "each," to insert "clerk, \$1,800;" and in line 9, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" so that the clause will read "assistant in stationary room, \$1,000, and \$400 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; two messengers, at \$1,440 each;" and in line 13, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the Secretary from \$69,586 to \$71,586.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "dollars," to insert "and \$1,000 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent;" so as to read:

Clerks and messengers to committees: For clerk of printing records, \$2,230; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, \$3,000, and \$1,000 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Clerks and messengers to committees," in the appropriations of the Senate, on page 5, line 22, after the word "Tributaries," to insert "Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 2, to increase the total appropriation of the Senate for clerks and messengers to committees from \$124,540 to \$127,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 4, to insert:

For additional amount for the clerk to the Committee on Rules, for revising and preparing for publication, biennially, under the direction of the committee, the Senate Manual, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 9, to reduce the number of clerks to committees from 20 to 19; and in line 10, to reduce the total appropriation for clerks to committees at \$1,800 each from \$36,000 to \$34,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 25, after the word "room," to insert "to be selected by the official reporters;" on page 7, line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert "two skilled laborers, at \$900 each;" in line 12, before the word "dollars," to



strike out "seven hundred and twenty" and insert "nine hundred;" in line 14, before the word "laborers," to strike out "four" and insert "two;" in line 16, before the word "laborers," to strike out "twenty-nine" and insert "twenty-eight;" and in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty-seven thousand two hundred and twenty-four" and insert "fifty-six thousand nine hundred and eighty-four;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper: For Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper, \$4,500; horse and wagon for his use, \$420, or so much thereof as may be necessary; for clerk to Sergeant-at-Arms, \$2,000; assistant doorkeeper, \$2,592; acting assistant doorkeeper, \$2,592; 3 messengers, acting as assistant doorkeepers, at \$1,800 each; 47 messengers, at \$1,440 each; 2 assistant messengers on the floor of the Senate, at \$1,440 each; messenger to official reporters' room, to be selected by the official reporters, \$1,440; messenger in charge of storeroom, \$1,440; upholsterer and locksmith, \$1,440; 3 carpenters to assist him, at \$900 each; skilled laborer, \$1,000; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 2 janitors, at \$900 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$840; 2 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring room, at \$720 each; 2 telephone operators, at \$900 each; telephone page, \$900; press gallery page, \$720; 2 laborers, at \$840 each; 24 laborers, at \$900 each; 28 laborers, at \$720 each; 16 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$2.50 per day each during the session, \$3,280; in all, \$156,984.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 7, to increase the appropriation for salary of assistant in folding room from \$1,200 to \$1,400; in line 9, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the foreman in the folding room from \$1,200 to \$1,400; in line 10, to increase the number of folders, at \$840 each, from 13 to 14; and in line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the folding room from \$26,280 to \$27,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 17, before the word "conductors," to strike out "seven" and insert "eight;" in line 18, after the word "each," to strike out "machinist and assistant conductor of elevators, \$1,000;" in line 21, before the word "dollars," to insert "four hundred;" in line 24, before the word "hundred," to strike out "twenty-five thousand nine" and insert "twenty-six thousand five;" so as to make the clause read:

Under Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds: For chief engineer, \$2,160; four assistant engineers, at \$1,440 each; eight conductors of elevators, at \$1,200 each; machinist and electrician, \$1,400; three firemen, at \$1,065 each; six laborers, at \$720 each; in all, \$26,525.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 25, to increase the number of annual clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees from 30 to 35; and on page 9, line 2, to increase the appropriation for salaries of annual clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees from \$45,000 to \$52,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 19, to increase the appropriation for fuel, oil, and cotton waste and advertising, for the heating apparatus, exclusive of labor, from \$20,000 to \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 2, to increase the appropriation for miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 5, to increase the appropriation for miscellaneous items on account of the Maltby Building from \$16,840 to \$18,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 18, to insert:

To enable the Committee on Claims to complete the preparation of a record and index of private claims introduced in the Senate during the Fifty-sixth and Fifty-seventh Congresses, \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be paid upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee; and said sum or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman, may be paid as additional compensation to any officer or employee of the United States, and shall be immediately available. Said work shall be completed and reported to the Senate on the first day of the first regular session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, and the usual number of copies shall be printed ready for distribution on said date.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 6, to increase the appropriation for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory from \$1,200 to \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 4, to increase the appropriation for janitor to the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, from \$720 to \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the appropriations for the House, on page 16, line 16, after the word "each," to insert "assistant clerk to the Committee on the Judiciary, \$1,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 6, to increase the total appropriation for clerks and messengers of committees, House of Representatives, from \$88,040 to \$89,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library of Congress," on page 24, line 22, after the word "dollars," to strike

out "one stenographer and typewriter, \$1,000," and insert "two stenographers and typewriters, at \$1,000 each;" and on page 25, line 2, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventeen" and insert "eighteen;" so as to make the clause read:

General administration: For Librarian of Congress, \$6,000; chief assistant librarian, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Librarian's secretary, \$1,800; one clerk (assistant to chief clerk), \$1,000; two stenographers and typewriters, at \$1,000 each; one messenger, \$840; in all, \$18,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 4, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant in charge of Mail and Supply Division, Library of Congress, from \$1,200 to \$1,500; and in line 6, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Mail and Supply Division, Library of Congress, from \$2,460 to \$2,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 20, after the word "dollars," to insert "two assistants, at \$2,000 each;" in line 21, before the word "assistants," to strike out "five" and insert "three;" and on page 26, line 9, before the word "hundred," to strike out "eighty-seven thousand seven" and insert "eighty-eight thousand one;" so as to make the clause read:

Catalogue and shelf: For chief of division, \$3,000; 2 assistants, at \$2,000 each; 3 assistants, at \$1,800 each; 7 assistants, at \$1,500 each; 6 assistants, at \$1,400 each; 12 assistants, at \$1,200 each; 6 assistants, at \$1,000 each; 14 assistants, at \$900 each; 4 assistants, at \$800 each; 13 assistants, at \$720 each; 3 assistants, at \$600 each; 10 assistants, at \$540 each; 4 assistants, at \$480 each; 6 messengers, at \$360 each; in all, \$83,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 15, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 16, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 17, after the word "dollars," to insert "one stenographer, nine hundred dollars;" and in line 20, before the word "hundred," to strike out "six thousand five" and insert "eight thousand one," so as to make the clause read:

Bibliography: For chief of division, \$3,000; 1 assistant, \$1,400; 2 assistants, at \$900 each; 1 assistant, \$720; 1 stenographer, \$900; and 1 messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$8,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 25, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one assistant of the Division of Documents, Library of Congress, from \$1,200 to \$1,400; and on page 28, line 4, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Division of Documents from \$6,180 to \$6,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 10, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the chief of division, Maps and Charts, from \$2,500 to \$3,000; in line 12, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one assistant in the Division of Maps and Charts from \$1,200 to \$1,400; and in line 15 to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Division of Maps and Charts from \$6,580 to \$7,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 23, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one assistant in the Division of Prints from \$1,200 to \$1,400, and, on page 29, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Division of Prints from \$5,360 to \$5,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 16, to increase the appropriation for purchase of books for the Library of Congress, and for freight, commissions, etc., from \$80,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for the general administration of the Library of Congress from \$91,300 to \$111,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Botanic Garden," on page 34, line 24, to increase the appropriation for assistants and laborers under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress from \$12,093.75 to \$12,593.75.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Executive," on page 35, line 24, after the word "dollars," to insert "laborer, \$600;" and on page 36, line 1, before the word "hundred," to strike out "one" and insert "seven;" so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to the following in the office of the President of the United States: Secretary, \$5,000; 2 assistant secretaries, at \$3,000 each; executive clerk, \$2,500; executive clerk and disbursing officer, \$2,000; 2 clerks, at \$2,000 each; 6 clerks of class 4; 1 clerk of class 4, who shall be a telegrapher; 4 clerks of class 3; usher to the President, \$1,800; steward, \$1,300; chief doorkeeper, \$1,800; 8 doorkeepers, at \$1,200 each; 4 messengers, at \$1,200 each; 5 messengers, at \$900 each; watchman, \$900; 1 fireman; laborer, \$720; laborer, \$600; in all, \$65,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Civil Service

Commission," on page 36, line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Civil Service Commission from \$163,660 to \$164,060.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 37, line 16, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "two hundred and fifty;" in line 21, before the word "clerks," to strike out "seven" and insert "eight;" in line 22, before the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty-six" and insert "twenty-seven;" and on page 38, line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "sixty-nine" and insert "seventy-three;" so as to make the clause read:

For compensation of the Secretary of State, \$8,000; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; Second and Third Assistant Secretaries, at \$4,500 each; chief clerk, \$3,000; assistant solicitor of the Department of State, to be appointed by the Secretary of State, to edit the laws of Congress and perform such other duties as may be required of them, at \$2,500 and \$1,500, respectively; 8 chiefs of bureaus, at \$2,250 each; 2 translators, at \$2,100 each; additional to Chief of Bureau of Accounts as disbursing clerk, \$200; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; 12 clerks of class 4; 8 clerks of class 3; 13 clerks of class 2; 27 clerks of class 1, one of whom is to be a telegraph operator; 5 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 12 clerks, at \$900 each; chief messenger, \$1,000; 2 messengers; 15 assistant messengers; packer, \$720; and for temporary typewriters and stenographers, to be selected by the Secretary, \$2,000; in all, \$173,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 8, to increase the appropriation for the purchase of books and maps for the library of the Department of State from \$2,000 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 16, to increase the total appropriation for contingent expenses of the Department of State from \$3,500 to \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," on page 39, line 1, to increase the appropriation for the salary of Government actuary under the control of the Treasury from \$2,000 to \$2,250; in the same line to increase the number of clerks of class 2 in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury from one to two; and in line 4, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the Secretary of the Treasury from \$44,180 to \$45,830.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 15, to increase the number of clerks of class 3 in the office of chief clerk and superintendent from two to three; in line 16, to reduce the number of clerks of class 1 from four to three, and on page 41, line 3, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of chief clerk and superintendent from \$184,100 to \$184,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 18, to increase the number of clerks of class 1 in the Division of Customs from two to three, and in line 21, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Division of Customs from \$32,290 to \$33,490.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 9, after the word "and," to strike out "one laborer" and insert "two laborers;" in line 10, after the word "all," to strike out "twenty-one thousand four hundred and sixty" and insert "twenty-two thousand one hundred and twenty," and in line 11, after the word "dollars," to insert:

*Provided*, That from and after the approval of this act the probationary term of cadets in the Revenue-Cutter Service shall be three years instead of two years, as now provided by law.

So as to make the clause read:

Division of Revenue-Cutter Service: For assistant chief of division, \$2,400; 1 clerk of class 4; 4 clerks of class 3; 2 clerks of class 2; 3 clerks of class 1; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 clerks, at \$900 each, and 2 laborers; in all, \$22,120. *Provided*, That from and after the approval of this act the probationary term of cadets in the Revenue-Cutter Service shall be three years instead of two years, as now provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 19, after the word "three," to insert "1 clerk of class 2;" in the same line, before the word "of," to strike out "2 clerks" and insert "1 clerk;" and in line 22, before the word "hundred," to strike out "twelve thousand nine" and insert "thirteen thousand one;" so as to make the clause read:

Miscellaneous division: For chief of division, \$2,500; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; 1 clerk of class 4; 1 clerk of class 3; 1 clerk of class 2; 1 clerk of class 1; clerk, \$1,000; clerk, \$900, and 1 assistant messenger; in all, \$13,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 19, after the word "Spain," to insert "transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the legislative appropriation act, approved April 28, 1902;" so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the following additional force rendered necessary because of increased work incident to the war with Spain transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the legislative appropriation act, approved April 28, 1902: seven clerks of class 4; 13 clerks of class 3; 8 clerks

of class 2; 30 clerks of class 1; 10 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 10 clerks, at \$900 each, and 3 laborers; in all, \$101,580.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 18, after the word "Spain," to insert "transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the legislative appropriation act approved April 28, 1902;" so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the following additional force rendered necessary because of increased work incident to the war with Spain, transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the legislative appropriation act approved April 28, 1902: Two clerks of class 3; 3 clerks of class 2; 4 clerks of class 1; 6 clerks, at \$1,000 each; and 4 clerks, at \$900 each; in all, \$21,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 5, to increase the number of clerks of class 3 in the office of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department from 60 to 62; in line 6, to increase the number of clerks of class 2 from 81 to 83; in line 7, to increase the number of clerks of class 1 from 102 to 104; in line 9, to increase the number of clerks at \$900 each from 70 to 71; and in line 15, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department from \$666,310 to \$675,610.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 9, before the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty-nine" and insert "thirty;" in line 10, before the word "clerks," to strike out "seventeen" and insert "eighteen;" in line 11, before the word "clerks," to strike out "sixty-three" and insert "sixty-five;" in line 12, before the word "expert," to strike out "fifty" and insert "fifty-two;" in line 16, after the word "charwomen," to insert "foreman of pressmen, \$1,500;" in line 17, before the word "pressmen," to strike out "twelve" and insert "eleven;" and in line 23, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eighty-three thousand two hundred and ten" and insert "eighty-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Treasurer: For Treasurer of the United States, \$6,000; assistant treasurer, \$3,600; deputy assistant treasurer, \$3,200; cashier, \$3,600; assistant cashier, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; 7 chiefs of division, at \$2,500 each; assistant chief of division, \$2,250; vault clerk, \$2,500; principal bookkeeper, \$2,500; assistant bookkeeper, \$2,100; 2 tellers, at \$2,500 each; 2 assistant tellers, at \$2,250 each; clerk for the treasurer, \$1,800; 23 clerks of class 1, 18 clerks of class 3; 14 clerks of class 2; coin clerk, \$1,400; 30 clerks of class 1, 18 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 65 clerks, at \$900 each; 52 expert counters, at \$720 each; 9 clerks, at \$700 each; mail messenger, \$340; 7 messengers; 6 assistant messengers; 30 laborers; 9 charwomen; foreman of pressmen, \$1,500; 11 pressmen, at \$1,400 each; 24 separators, at \$960 each; 17 feeders, at \$960 each; compositor and pressman, \$1,400; machinist, \$900; in all, \$388,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 13, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Assistant Register of the Treasury from \$2,250 to \$2,500; and, in line 20, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the office of the Register of the Treasury from \$72,910 to \$73,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 24, after the word "Spain," to insert "transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the legislative appropriation act approved April 28, 1902;" so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the following additional force rendered necessary because of increased work incident to the war with Spain transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the legislative appropriation act approved April 28, 1902: Three clerks of class 1; and 3 clerks at \$1,000 each; in all, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 6, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency from "\$2,800" to "\$3,000;" and in line 17 to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the Comptroller from "\$112,420" to "\$112,620."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 4, after the word "macerator," to insert "and for procuring information relative to banks other than national;" so as to make the clause read:

For expenses of special examinations of national banks and bank plates, of keeping macerator in Treasury building in repair, and for other incidental expenses attending the working of the macerator, and for procuring information relative to banks other than national, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert "bookkeeper, \$1,800;" in line 7, before the word "of," to strike out "two clerks," and insert "one clerk;" and in line 17, after the word "thousand," to insert "two hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Light-House Board: For chief clerk, \$2,400; title and contract clerk, \$2,000; accountant, \$2,000; bookkeeper, \$1,800; 1 clerk of class 3; 3 clerks of class 2; 6 clerks of class 1; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 10 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 1 clerk, \$720; 2 assistant messengers; 1 laborer; assistant civil engineer, \$2,400; draftsman, \$1,800; draftsman, \$1,560; draftsman, \$1,440; draftsman, \$1,200; in all, \$44,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 20, after the word



"dollars," to insert "and \$500 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent;" on page 56, line 3, after the word "dollars," to strike out "one assistant messenger," and insert "two assistant messengers;" and in line 6, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty-four thousand six hundred and eighty," and insert "forty-five thousand nine hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Life-Saving Service: For General Superintendent of Life-Saving Service, \$4,000, and \$500 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; assistant general superintendent, \$2,500; principal clerk, \$2,000; topographer and hydrographer, \$1,800; civil engineer, \$1,800; draftsman, \$1,500; 4 clerks of class 4; 5 clerks of class 3; 4 clerks of class 2; 5 clerks of class 1; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, \$900; 2 assistant messengers; and 1 laborer; in all, \$45,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 24, before the word "dollars," to strike out "three thousand five hundred" and insert "four thousand;" on page 57, line 7, after the word "messenger," to strike out "one assistant messenger" and insert "two assistant messengers;" and in line 11, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixty thousand three hundred and fifty" and insert "sixty-one thousand five hundred and seventy;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Statistics: For officer in charge of the Bureau of Statistics, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,250; statistical clerk, \$2,000; 4 clerks of class 4; 3 clerks of class 3; 1 clerk, expert in foreign statistics and languages, to compile Statistical Abstract of the World, \$1,600; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,500; 7 clerks of class 2; 10 clerks of class 1; translator, \$1,200; 10 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 copyists; 1 messenger; 2 assistant messengers; 1 laborer; and 1 female laborer, \$480; in all, \$61,570.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 15, to increase the appropriation for payment of the services of experts and for other necessary expenditures connected with the collection of facts relative to the internal and foreign commerce of the United States from \$4,000 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seven hundred and twenty" and insert "eight hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

For fuel for heat, light, and power; office expenses, stationery, printing, and binding; traveling expenses; expenses of the visiting committee; expenses of attendance of American member at the meeting of the International Committee of Weights and Measures; rent of building at 235 New Jersey avenue as temporary laboratory, not to exceed \$840; and contingencies of all kinds, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 18, before the word "Surgeon-General," to strike out "Supervising;" in line 20, before the word "Surgeon-General," to strike out "Supervising;" in line 21, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred;" and on page 61, line 4, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two hundred and ninety" and insert "five hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Surgeon-General of Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service: For Surgeon-General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,000, and \$500 additional as disbursing agent for the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; 2 clerks of class 4; 5 clerks of class 3; 5 clerks of class 2; 5 clerks of class 1; clerk and translator, \$1,200; 3 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 messenger; and 5 laborers, at \$540 each; in all, \$39,540, the same to be paid from the permanent appropriations for the Marine-Hospital Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 16, after the word "dollars," to strike out "and \$250 additional for services while acting as Commissioner of Immigration;" in line 21, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" in line 23, before the word "hundred," to strike out "six" and insert "eight;" and on page 62, line 3, before the word "dollars," to strike out "and twenty-six" and insert "one hundred and seventy-six;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Immigration: For Commissioner General of Immigration, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; confidential clerk, \$1,800; statistician and stenographer, with power to act as immigrant inspector, \$2,000; 1 supervising immigrant inspector, to be attached to this Bureau in Washington for special work outside, \$1,800; 1 messenger; 1 assistant messenger; 1 clerk of class 2; for the following, to be immediately available: One clerk of class 1; 1 clerk, at the rate of \$1,000 per annum; and 1 copyist; in all, \$19,176, which, together with other expenses of regulating immigration, including the cost of the Federal Reporter, shall be paid from the permanent appropriation for expenses regulating immigration.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 20, to increase the appropriation for newspapers, law books, city directories, and other books of reference relating to the business of the Treasury Department from \$1,200 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 11, to increase the appropriation for purchase of horses and wagons for office and mail service, to be used only for official purposes, etc., from \$3,500 to \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 20, to increase the appropriation for purchase of coal, wood, engine oils and grease, grates, etc., from \$9,500 to \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 2, to increase the appropriation for purchase of gas, electric current for lighting and power purposes, gas and electric light fixtures, etc., from \$14,000 to \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 2, to increase the appropriation for purchase of carpets, carpet border and lining, linoleum, mats, rugs, etc., from \$4,000 to \$4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Independent Treasury," on page 66, line 22, before the word "clerks," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 24, before the word "clerks," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" on page 67, line 1, after the word "dollars," to insert "watchman and porter, \$720;" in line 2, before the word "vault," to strike out "three" and insert "two;" and in line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike "twenty-three" and insert "twenty-seven;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at Baltimore: For assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,500; 3 clerks, at \$1,800 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,400 each; bookkeeper and 4 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$840; watchman and porter, \$720; 2 vault watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$27,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 10, after the word "each," to insert "assistant receiving teller, \$1,600;" in line 16, before the word "clerks," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in line 23, before the word "hundred," to strike out "thirty-eight thousand nine" and insert "forty-one thousand seven;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at Boston: For assistant treasurer, \$5,000; chief clerk and paying teller, at \$2,500 each; assistant paying teller, \$2,200; vault clerk and receiving teller, at \$2,000 each; assistant receiving teller, \$1,600; first bookkeeper, \$1,800; second bookkeeper, \$1,400; specie clerk, \$1,800; assistant specie clerk and money clerk, at \$1,500 each; redemption clerk, and one clerk, at \$1,400 each; 3 clerks, at \$1,300 each; clerk, \$1,100; 3 clerks at \$1,000 each; clerk, \$900; messenger and chief watchman, \$1,000; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,000; 3 watchmen and janitors, at \$850 each; in all, \$41,710.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 4, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" in line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" in line 8, before the word "hundred," to strike out "seven" and insert "eight;" in line 9, after the word "dollars," to strike out "bookkeeper, \$1,500," and insert "two bookkeepers, at \$1,500 each;" in line 11, before the word "coin," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" in line 16, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seven hundred and twenty" and insert "nine hundred;" and in line 19, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty-three thousand one hundred and twenty" and insert "fifty-six thousand eight hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at Chicago: For assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$2,500; vault clerk, \$2,000; paying teller, \$2,000; assistant paying teller, \$1,500; assorting teller, \$1,800; receiving teller, \$1,800; clerk, \$1,600; 2 bookkeepers, at \$1,500 each; 4 coin, coupon, and currency clerks, at \$1,500 each; 20 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 1 detective and hall man, \$1,100; messenger, \$840; stenographer, \$900; janitor, \$300; and 3 watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$56,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 22, before the word "dollars," to insert "two hundred and fifty;" on page 69, line 1, after the word "dollars," to strike out "one clerk, \$1,200," and insert "three clerks, at \$1,200 each;" in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "nineteen thousand three hundred and sixty" and insert "twenty-two thousand and ten;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at Cincinnati: For assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,250; bookkeeper, \$1,800; receiving teller, \$1,500; 2 clerks, at \$1,200 each; interest clerk, \$1,200; 3 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk and stenographer, \$720; clerk and watchman, \$840; night watchman, \$900; day watchman, \$900; in all, \$22,010.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 13, to increase the number of clerks in the office of the assistant treasurer at New Orleans from five to six, and in line 19 to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the assistant treasurer at New Orleans from \$22,890 to \$24,090.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 10, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 12, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 16, after the word "and," to strike out "messenger" and insert "clerk;" and in line 20, before the word "hundred," to strike out "three" and insert "seven;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at St. Louis: For assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier and chief clerk, \$2,500; first teller, \$2,000; second teller, \$1,800; third

teller, \$1,600; fourth teller, \$1,400; assorting teller, \$1,800; coin teller, \$1,400; bookkeeper, \$1,500; 3 assistant bookkeepers and 3 clerks, at \$1,200 each; assistant coin teller, stenographer and typewriter, and clerk, at \$1,000 each; 5 day watchmen and coin counters, at \$900 each; night watchman, \$720; and janitor, \$900; in all, \$32,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Mints and assay offices," on page 79, line 16, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter at the assay office at Seattle, Wash., from \$2,500 to \$3,000; and in line 21 to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the assay office at Seattle, Wash., from \$10,000 to \$10,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Government in the Territories," on page 82, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That that portion of an act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved April 23, 1902, which provides that the legislative assembly of the Territory of Oklahoma shall not make any appropriation or enter into any contract for a capitol building, or any other public building, shall not apply to the Territorial Normal School at Edmond, in said Territory.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 4, after the word "dollars," to insert "for traveling expenses, \$134.50; in all \$5,134.50;" so as to make the clause read:

Territory of Porto Rico: For salary of the resident commissioner from Porto Rico to the United States, authorized by the act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, approved April 12, 1900, \$5,000; for traveling expenses, \$134.50; in all, \$5,134.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," on page 84, line 11, after the word "Spain," to insert:

as were transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved April 23, 1902, and.

In line 21, after the word "exigencies," to strike out "of the needs;" and in line 23, after the word "dollars," to strike out:

Persons in the classified service of the Government shall not be eligible to appointment under this appropriation or other appropriations for additional employees because of increased work incident to the war with Spain, or to be transferred from any position in the classified service to positions paid under this or said other appropriations.

So as to make the clause read:

For continuing the employment of such additional temporary force of clerks, messengers, laborers, and other assistants, rendered necessary because of increased work incident to the war with Spain, as were transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved April 23, 1902, and as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of official business in the War Department and its bureaus, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to such bureaus and offices as the exigencies of the service may demand, \$541,430.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 20, after the word "four," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That under the direction of the Secretary of War the Chief of the Record and Pension Office shall compile, from such official records as are in the possession of the United States and from such other authentic records as may be obtained by loan from the various States and other official sources, a complete roster of the officers and enlisted men of the Union and Confederate armies.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 22, to increase the appropriation for rent of building for Ordnance and Signal Offices from \$2,100 to \$2,500; in line 24, to increase the appropriation for rent of building for War Department from \$6,000 to \$7,200, and, on page 91, line 2, to increase the total appropriation for rent of buildings for the use of the War Department from \$15,600 to \$17,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public Buildings and Grounds," on page 92, line 8, to increase the appropriation for the salary of day watchmen in the public parks of the District of Columbia from \$720 each to \$780 each; and in line 9, to increase the total appropriation for the salaries of day watchmen in the public parks of the District of Columbia from \$15,120 to \$16,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 15, to increase the appropriation for the salary of 10 night watchmen in the public parks of the District of Columbia from \$720 each to \$780 each; and in line 15, to increase the total appropriation for the salaries of 10 night watchmen referred to, from \$7,200 to \$7,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 1, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-nine thousand one hundred and

thirty-five" and insert "thirty thousand and sixty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

Of the foregoing amounts appropriated under public buildings and grounds the sum of \$30,065 shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "State, War, and Navy Department building," on page 93, line 5, after the word "class," to strike out "one" and insert "two;" in line 7, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 9, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seven hundred and twenty" and insert "eight hundred and forty;" and in line 21, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-eight thousand three hundred" and insert "twenty-nine thousand three hundred and eighty;" so as to make the clause read:

STATE, WAR, AND NAVY DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

Office of the superintendent: For 1 clerk of class 2; stenographer and typewriter, \$900; chief engineer, \$1,400; 9 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; captain of the watch, \$1,400; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at \$840 each; 58 watchmen; carpenter, \$1,000; electrician, \$1,000; plumber, 3 machinists, and painter, at \$900 each; 4 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 29 firemen; 10 conductors of elevators, at \$720 each; 19 laborers; 81 charwomen; 1 gardener, \$720; and 2 telephone operators, at \$600 each; in all, \$129,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 94, line 7, to increase the number of clerks of class 1 in the office of the Secretary of the Navy from three to four; and in line 11, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of Secretary of the Navy from \$50,030 to \$51,230.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 12, after the word "Dispensary," to insert "and janitor;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: For chief clerk, \$2,000; one clerk of class 4; one clerk of class 3; one clerk of class 2; one clerk of class 1; one clerk, \$1,000; two copyists, at \$840 each; one laborer; driver for Naval Dispensary, and janitor, \$300, and one laborer, \$480 (for Naval Dispensary); in all, \$12,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 22, before the word "books," to insert "and technical;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses of the Navy Department, namely: For professional and technical books and periodicals for Department library, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 105, line 23, to increase the appropriation for clerk in charge of documents in the office of the Secretary from \$2,000 to \$2,100; on page 106, line 1, to increase the appropriation for the salary of custodian in the office of the Secretary from \$2,000 to \$2,100; and on page 107, line 3, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the office of Secretary of the Interior from \$318,730 to \$318,930.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, after line 4, to insert:

For pay of one clerk, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him, his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for all of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, \$1,200, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 111, line 25, after the word "four," to insert "additional to one clerk of class 4, acting as special disbursing agent, \$200;" on page 112, line 4, before the word "clerks," to strike out "eleven" and insert "twelve;" in line 7, before the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty-six" and insert "twenty-seven;" in line 8, before the word "clerks," to strike out "fourteen" and insert "fifteen;" in line 11, before the word "copyists," to strike out "seventeen" and insert "sixteen;" and in line 15, before the word "hundred," to strike out "forty thousand seven" and insert "forty-three thousand six;" so as to make the clause read:

Indian Office: For the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, \$5,000; Assistant Commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$3,000; financial clerk, \$2,000; 2 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; principal bookkeeper, \$1,800; 4 clerks of class 4, additional to 1 clerk of class 4 acting as special disbursing agent, \$200; 15 clerks of class 3; stenographer, \$1,600; stenographer, \$1,400; 12 clerks of class 2; draftsman, \$1,600; draftsman, \$1,500; architect, \$1,500; 27 clerks of class 1; 15 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, \$1,200, and 1 stenographer and 1 clerk, at \$1,000 each, to superintendent of Indian schools; 16 copyists; 1 messenger; 4 assistant messengers; 3 laborers; messenger boy, \$360; and 4 charwomen; in all, \$143,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 9, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the captain of the watch in the Pension Office from \$840 to \$900, and in line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Pension Office from \$1,962,210 to \$1,962,270.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 117, line 7, to increase the appropriation for purchase of professional and scientific books and expenses of transporting publications of patents issued by the Patent Office to foreign governments from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 121, line 11, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eight hundred;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "assistant draftsman, eight hundred dollars;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds: For Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,000; chief electrical engineer, \$2,400; draftsman, \$1,000; assistant draftsman, \$800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, line 17, after the word "Department," to strike out "seven hundred and fifty" and insert "one thousand two hundred and fifty;" and after the word "dollars," in line 18, to insert "of which sum \$500 may be used for the Civil Service Commission;" so as to make the clause read:

For professional and scientific books, law books, and books to complete broken sets, periodicals, directories, and other books of reference relating to the business of the Department, \$1,250, of which sum \$500 may be used for the Civil Service Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 123, line 1, to increase the appropriation for rent of building for the Civil Service Commission from \$4,000 to \$5,000, and in line 3, to increase the total appropriation for rent of buildings for the Department of the Interior from \$51,400 to \$52,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 123, line 15, to increase the appropriation for clerks in the office of the surveyor-general of the district of Alaska from \$4,000 to \$5,000, and in the same line, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the surveyor-general of Alaska from \$8,000 to \$9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 125, line 1, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of clerks in the office of the surveyor-general of Idaho from \$8,500 to \$9,000, and in line 2, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the surveyor-general of Idaho from \$10,500 to \$11,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 125, line 17, to increase the appropriation for salaries of clerks in the office of the surveyor-general of Minnesota from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and in the same line, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the surveyor-general of Minnesota from \$3,800 to \$4,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 5, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of clerks in the office of the surveyor-general of Nevada from \$2,000 to \$3,000; and in line 6, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the surveyor-general of Nevada from \$3,800 to \$4,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Post-Office Department," on page 128, line 22, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the appointment clerk in the office of the Postmaster-General from \$1,800 to \$2,000; and, on page 129, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the Postmaster-General from \$36,720 to \$36,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 129, line 11, to increase the number of clerks of class 2 in the office of the Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department from 1 to 2; in the same line, to reduce the number of clerks of class 1 from 2 to 1, and in line 13, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the office of Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department from \$13,670 to \$13,870.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 129, line 16, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the First Assistant Postmaster-General from \$4,500 to \$5,000; in line 18, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Superintendent of the Money-Order System in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General from \$3,000 to \$3,500; in line 19, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the chief clerk of the Money-Order System from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and on page 130, line 14, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General from \$308,500 to \$310,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, line 19, after the word "Spain," to insert "as were transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the legislative appropriation act approved April 28, 1902, and;" so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the employment of such additional temporary force of clerks and other employees rendered necessary because of increase of work incident to the war with Spain as were transferred to the classified service under the provisions of section 3 of the legislative appropriation act approved

April 28, 1902, and as in the judgment of the Postmaster-General may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of the business in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 23, after the word "two" to insert "1 clerk of class 1;" so as to read:

Office of disbursing clerk: Disbursing clerk and superintendent of buildings, \$2,250; bookkeeper and accountant, \$1,800; 1 clerk of class 2; 1 clerk of class 1; engineer, \$1,400; 8 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, line 15, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the office of disbursing clerk in the Post-Office Department from \$2,330 to \$4,530.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, line 20, to increase the appropriation for stationery and blank books, including amount necessary for the purchase of free penalty envelopes in the Post-Office Department, from \$7,000 to \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, line 25, to increase the appropriation for gas and electric lights in the Post-Office Department from \$1,000 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 136, line 2, to increase the appropriation for telegraphing for the Post-Office Department from \$4,000 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 136, line 9, to increase the appropriation for the Post-Office Department for furniture, including \$1,500 for the office of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department, from \$5,000 to \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 136, after line 9, to insert: For furnishing a complete system of steel document and letter files for the classification division of the office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, \$2,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 136, line 23, before the word "hundred," to strike out "one" and insert "two;" so as to read:

For miscellaneous items, including \$2,500 for the office of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department, \$18,000, of which sum not exceeding \$3,985 may be expended for telephone service, and not exceeding \$900, including \$300 for the office of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," on page 138, line 24, before the word "clerks," to strike out "three" and insert "two;" on page 139, line 2, before the word "appointment," to strike out "additional for disbursing clerk, \$500," and insert "disbursing clerk, \$2,750;" in line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert "one messenger;" in line 7, before the word "assistant," to strike out "eight" and insert "seven;" and in line 17, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eighty-three thousand five hundred and seventy" and insert "eighty-four thousand six hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Office of the Attorney-General: For compensation of the Attorney-General, \$8,000; \* \* \* 2 clerks of class 4; attorney in charge of pardons, \$2,400; disbursing clerk, \$2,750; appointment clerk, \$2,000; 6 clerks of class 3; 3 clerks of class 2; 6 clerks of class 1; telegraph operator and stenographer, \$1,200; 9 copyists; 1 chief messenger, \$1,000; 1 messenger; 7 assistant messengers; 4 laborers; 3 watchmen; engineer, \$1,200; 2 conductors of the elevator, at \$720 each; 8 charwomen; superintendent of building, \$250; and 3 firemen; Division of Accounts: Chief of division of accounts, \$2,500; 4 clerks of class 4; 5 clerks of class 3; 6 clerks of class 2; 6 clerks of class 1; 2 copyists; 1 packer, \$840; in all, \$184,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 140, line 7, after the word "provisions," to insert "of the act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, and;" and in line 13, after the word "ninety," to insert "and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto;" so as to make the clause read:

That for the enforcement of the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, and of the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, and sections 73, 74, 75, and 76 of the act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and other purposes," approved August 27, 1894, the sum of \$500,000, to be immediately available, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not heretofore appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney-General in the employment of special counsel and agents of the Department of Justice to conduct proceedings, suits, and prosecutions under said acts in the courts of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 141, line 13, to increase the appropriation for the rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia used by the Department of Justice from \$20,100 to \$20,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judicial," on

page 143, line 25, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States from \$3,000 to \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 144, line 4, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Supreme Court of the United States from \$107,900 to \$108,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 144, line 9, to increase the appropriation for the salary of clerks of circuit courts of appeals from \$3,000 to \$3,500 each, and in line 10 to increase the total appropriation for the salaries of nine clerks of circuit courts of appeals from \$27,000 to \$31,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 144, line 13, to increase the total appropriation for circuit courts of appeals from \$185,000 to \$189,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 145, line 14, to increase the appropriation for reporter, court of appeals, District of Columbia, from \$1,200 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for court of appeals, District of Columbia, on page 145, after line 16, to insert:

For crier, \$900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 145, line 20, to increase the total appropriation for the court of appeals of the District of Columbia from \$25,920 to \$27,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 148, line 14, before the word "incapacitated," to strike out "incompetent or" and insert "permanently;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the public service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons permanently incapacitated for performing such service.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the vote on the amendments be taken in the Senate in gross? The Chair hears no objection.

The amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

HENRY M. HOLMES.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1193) to correct the military record of Henry M. Holmes.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "organization," to insert "as of the date of July 31, 1862;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to amend the records of the War Department in the case of Henry M. Holmes, late of Company A, First New Mexico Cavalry Volunteers, and issue to him an honorable discharge from said organization as of the date of July 31, 1862: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13679) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898. I merely desire to have the bill read. I do not propose to ask action upon it now.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. QUAY. I now ask for the regular order.

Mr. HOAR. I gave notice that I would not ask for the passage of the bill to-day, and I certainly shall not if there be any objection now, or if any Senator wishes to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOAR. If no Senator desires to have it delayed, I will ask

that it be put on its passage. If any Senator desires to be heard, of course I do not press it.

Mr. QUAY. I feel it to be my duty to object to it at present.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; let it go over.

Mr. PETTUS. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not insist upon a vote on the bill this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it has been read for information and is now in the Committee of the Whole, and goes over.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I believe the unfinished business is now up.

#### STATEHOOD BILL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it becomes the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12543) to enable the people of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to form constitutions and State governments and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator want a vote before the Senators who desire to address the Senate upon this measure have an opportunity to be heard?

Mr. QUAY. I should like to have a vote, whether there is another word spoken on the bill or not. I believe a majority of the Senate are in favor of the bill and ready to vote now.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So the Senator said at the end of the last session. He further said on the floor of the Senate at the end of the last session that he and those with him did not care for further information. So I am not surprised at the attitude of the Senator to-day, which is but a repetition of the attitude taken here at the close of the last session.

I thought then, Mr. President, and I think now, that in a matter of such large consequence as the admission of new States into the Union—an act which will endure through the ages this Government endures—it was a remarkable position that Senators should assume, that they would care to state upon the floor of the Senate that they desired no investigation of a question so important and did not care for any further information on so vital a business.

Therefore the remark of the Senator that he wants a vote, whether anybody wants to speak or not, whether any person has any argument to adduce or not, is but a repetition of what was said here in the warm days of last June, just before the adjournment. At any time the Senator desires to discuss that peculiar feature of the situation I am sure that the Senator can be accommodated.

I will remark further, Mr. President, before I proceed, that it is a peculiar situation which confronted us then and which confronts us now; that repeatedly we had it stated in this the last forum of free speech in this world that there is no desire that Senators sent here to discuss great measures—discuss them as nearly as they can as statesmen should discuss them—shall not proceed with such debate, but that, counting votes as votes are counted in combinations in conventions, we shall proceed to pass measures of the gravest consequence to the nation not only for the present, but for all the future, without doing that very thing for which the Senate was first established and ordained; without doing that very thing, Mr. President, which gives the Senate of the United States to-day the great respect in which the Senate is held by the American people.

Mr. QUAY arose and addressed the Chair.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, what is it—

Mr. QUAY. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. QUAY. Do I understand the Senator from Indiana to be taking the floor to discuss the bill?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. QUAY. The reason for making the inquiry is that on yesterday the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM] gave notice that at 2 o'clock to-day he would proceed to discuss the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am aware of that, and if the Senator had not suggested that—despite any Senator desiring to proceed, despite the fact that any Senator might want to discharge what he considers his duty upon this floor, the Senator desired a vote—I should have gone ahead and asked the Senator from New Hampshire to yield to me for a few brief minutes while I make some observations that it seems pertinent to me that I should make at this particular juncture, and that, too, with the express desire, as I should have stated, not to infringe upon the valuable time of the Senator from New Hampshire longer than was necessary.

When I rose to speak, Mr. President, while I was on my feet and had addressed the Chair, and even before my first word asking the Senator from New Hampshire to yield, had been



uttered, the Senator from Pennsylvania announced that he desired a vote, and when I asked, "What! even before a Senator who is on his feet desiring to address the Senate on the pending measure has spoken?" "Yes," said the Senator, "we have the votes, and we want to vote anyhow."

Mr. QUAY. That is true; we have the votes to pass the bill. The majority of the Senate are in favor of it, and it is being willfully—I was about to use the adjective—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Go ahead; I hope the Senator will use the adjective.

Mr. QUAY. Willfully obstructed by discussion, as no one knows better than the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, let us put that question to the test of the facts. Since the Senator raises that question at this particular juncture, nothing can be more useful to the Senate and to the country than to find out who really is obstructing.

Mr. QUAY. You can discover that by a vote.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. QUAY. I say you can discover that by a vote.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Ah, I am very familiar, everybody is very familiar, even a young and inexperienced man in politics like myself, is familiar with that old and familiar trick of campaign and convention tactics—the trick of declaring "we have the votes and we are going to win." It was of some force when first uttered, perhaps, upon the minds of men, because it contained the psychic suggestion of victory and the consequent suggestion that people should get on the band wagon. Everybody fully understands the philosophy of that kind of tactics. The Senator, however, has worn out the force of it by constant repetition. He has assured us and the country, and he referred to rumors going through the corridors, and we have heard those rumors going through the corridors until we could not escape them, that the Senator from Pennsylvania had the votes whether or no, and that the Senator from Pennsylvania was invincible, and a whole lot of those things, until nobody pays much attention to them any more.

Mr. President, no person has a greater admiration for the political skill and management of the Senator from Pennsylvania than I have. I recognize my inefficiency even to express my appreciation of his surpassing cleverness as a political tactician. But since the Senator (and that is a subject upon which I had not intended to speak) has said that there is being willful obstruction here, I think there can be no more useful or opportune time, since the Senator himself gives the cue for it, than to discuss just what that means.

Here, Mr. President, we have before us an extraordinary measure, a measure which I believe (and I hope if I am wrong some Senator will correct me) is without precedent except once in the history of the United States, where three States of varying conditions, varying populations, not akin in any circumstance of nature, not related in resources, population, production, or development, with dissimilar merits and demerits, heterogeneous unlike, full of contrasts and all but antagonistic in their elements, are, nevertheless, all bunched together in a bill called an "omnibus" bill, a bill which might more properly be named from the point of view of political science or from the point of view of legal construction as a "mongrel" bill. We have that bill, backed, as the Senator himself says, by a combination formed at least many months ago, the core of which is impervious to argument and indifferent to investigation, disdainful of information; we have that bill pressed upon the Senate with uncommon persistence and impetuosity, and this, Mr. President, in spite of the fact that the consequences of this act, if passed, will remain as long as the Republic itself shall endure. Now, upon that measure—

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. QUAY. I desire merely to ask the Senator if the Senator objects to my asking for a vote and to the daily recurrence of that suggestion? I have a request to make now to which I should like to have his assent. I ask unanimous consent that a vote upon this bill be taken on Saturday, the 24th instant.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. While I yield to the Senator and every Senator—

Mr. QUAY. I am not sure—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. For all interruptions and questions when I am debating a measure here, and I not only yield, but I welcome such interruptions, I submit—

Mr. QUAY. Then do you object?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That the interruption of the Senator now, and the question he propounds to me while I am discussing the subject he himself has suggested is hardly pertinent, and therefore I do not have to answer it, and that, too, within all possible courtesy to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUAY. I am not asking of the Senator anything to which he shall assent especially. I am asking the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am rather inclined to think that if there

was unanimous consent it probably would have to include even the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. QUAY. Well, does the Senator from Indiana object?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I answer that that question at this point of the discussion precipitated by the Senator from Pennsylvania himself is not pertinent, and therefore I may be within the limits of all possible courtesy in declining—

Mr. QUAY. I ask that the request be put to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield except for a question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Or for any interruption which may throw light upon this controversy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Therefore the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania is not in order at this time.

Mr. QUAY. I will renew it when the Senator from Indiana has concluded his remarks.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have not any doubt that the Senator will renew it. There is one quality among many others which for years I have admired, and never so much as now, in the Senator from Pennsylvania, and that is an unfailing persistence. I have no doubt we may fairly look for a renewal of the request, and no doubt, Mr. President, when it comes we shall know how to take care of it, having due regard, to use the language of the Republican platform of 1896, to the interests of the people of the Territories and the interests of the people of the Republic, whose agents we are.

Now, Mr. President, let me pursue the question as to who is obstructing, and willfully obstructing. Let us find out whether or not debate of this most important matter (for it has wrapped up in it, in a measure, the determination of all questions of national policy, now and for all time to come) has been unduly prolonged.

By far the most serious measure of the session is before the Senate in this bill, and yet upon it we have had only two speeches on each side. My service in the Senate has been brief, only three or four years, and yet during that time measures of considerable consequence have been determined, but each of them measures of less moment than this. And yet debate has gone on freely, without any attempt on the part of the majority, who admittedly had the votes to pass any measure, to coerce the other side to a vote. Discussion has gone on uninterruptedly until Senators standing here and representing their States and doing their constitutional duty had presented to the Senate their opinions upon the subject.

I recall the Philippine tariff bill at the beginning of the last session. That bill was not profoundly vital. It did not contain a fraction of the importance which this measure contains. And yet the Senate discussed that bill for three or four weeks, or perhaps longer, and nobody heard anything about a suggestion that we were willfully obstructing legislation.

Does the Senator propose to change that which exalts and even sanctifies the Senate of the United States in the eyes of the nation and the world as nothing else does, to wit, the freedom of its rules of speech? I call the Senator's attention to the fact which I stated a moment ago, that on all this round globe to-day the only absolute forum of free discussion and debate, without cloture, without rules of limitation, where Senators may speak their minds and give to the country and to their associates their opinions without reserve, is the Senate of the United States.

Is it a fortunate or hopeful note to free institutions or the dignity of this body that is sounded by the Senator from Pennsylvania when he wants that ancient rule abolished, because he has a measure here which with precipitous haste he desires to have passed? Have I been immoderate in the use of the phrase "precipitous haste?" No one who will recall the history of the strategy adopted during the last session will say so. The Senator returned when the chairman of the Committee on Territories was away for a day or two and moved, without consultation with the chairman even, or his Republican associates upon the Territories Committee, that the committee be discharged, in order that this bill might be rushed through. I recall now, since the Senator has assumed the position of a prophet and says he has the votes to pass the bill and will pass the bill, that the Senator stated with a gravity which amounted to emphasis on the floor last session in discussing his motion to discharge the committee that, in his judgment, unless he could pass his omnibus bill at the last session it never would be passed. Is that still the opinion of the Senator?

Now, Mr. President, let us see who is obstructing legislation. The remark I quoted from the Senator from Pennsylvania a moment ago calls to the mind of all of us on both sides who were here at that time the attitude of the Senator, which was that he had a combination formed before debate was had, formed before men knew the facts in the case except as they were then known, formed before that investigation had taken place, and that with that combination he proposed to stop the consideration of all business—

Mr. SPOONER. And before the committee had reported.



Mr. BEVERIDGE. And before the committee had reported at the end of last session. That attitude upon the part of the Senator from Pennsylvania I distinctly remember called forth from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] an indignant protest that while he agreed to the arrangement that the committee should report on the 3d of December, he did not do it under duress of the threat of the Senator from Pennsylvania. That, Mr. President, was the beginning of the obstruction in this case.

Now, what is the exact situation? If I make any misstatement, I will stop in the course of it that the Senator may refute it. It is this, Mr. President: I do not know how long ago—there are manifestations that the heart of the organization existed a long time ago—but it became apparent in this Chamber some eight months ago, and I think was not denied, but even asserted with some pride by the Senator from Pennsylvania, that he had a combination of votes formed here whose heart and center was impervious to the assaults of reason; that he proposed to put through this measure, regardless of argument or fresh information; and that, unless the Senate of the United States submitted to the wishes of his combination in support of a bill which, with one exception, is without precedent in this body or in the Congress of the United States, no measure would be permitted to be passed.

Mr. QUAY. That statement of the Senator from Indiana is entirely false. I withdraw the word "false," and I will say untrue.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. QUAY. I make that correction.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then I may ask the Senator whether it is true that he secured, before he made the motion to discharge the committee, before the committee had reported, before it had time to make an investigation of this question—is it true that he had (I will wipe out the word "combination," if that is distasteful to the Senator, although I should imagine it would not be).

Mr. QUAY. The entire statement is untrue. The word "combination" is no more offensive than the remainder of the statement.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well. Mr. President, let us see. Then the Senator's statement was that there were a sufficient number of Senators pledged to vote for his measure to pass it, that he proposed to pass it, and that, unless it was passed, no business up to the time we finally agreed was to be transacted. Was that the case?

Mr. QUAY. That is not true.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then the Senator did not have the pledges?

Mr. QUAY. I am not talking about pledges, Mr. President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. QUAY. The Senator from Indiana was as busy as any Senator on this floor—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was. The Senator made me busy.

Mr. QUAY. In getting pledges.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No, Mr. President, I was busy as soon as I returned, having heard—I was about to quote what the Senator quoted from the conspiracy of Catiline at the beginning of this session, familiarity with which upon his part does not surprise me at all—the Senator had a sufficient number of votes, as he said—if he does not like the word "pledges" I will say votes. Anyway, he says he got them. I returned and found that out, and immediately I will say that the Senator did make me very busy indeed, seeing Senators in order to see that his votes did not remain with him; and I think, Mr. President, with some considerable measure of success.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. QUAY. I do not see, then, why the Senator from Indiana should complain of my doing exactly that which he states he himself did.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not get pledges from Senators to block legislation, or the consequence of which pledges meant that legislation should be blocked.

The Senator calls attention to the fact that I was busy at the same business. The Senator made me busy at the same business, Mr. President. The Senator asserted that he had certain votes. Well, it was my business as the chairman of the committee which he was attempting to discharge from the consideration of this matter to see that he did not have those votes if I could help it. I think, Mr. President, we helped it. So we reached an agreement—a pretty hard agreement it was, to be sure—an agreement fixing such an early date for the report as compelled this committee to work in this investigation immediately after the campaign, as few committees of either the Senate or the House of Representatives have ever worked, with conscientiousness and devotion, and, I trust, results.

Mr. President, I am glad to see the Senator weaken in his faith in the number of pledges of votes that he may have. That, however,

was the first step in this business of obstruction. I have only to appeal to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD upon that question; I have only to appeal to the recollection of every Senator upon this floor on either side upon that question; I have only to appeal to the common understanding of the country upon that question—the question of the Senator's attitude at the end of the last session. And, Mr. President, if I did not carefully and conscientiously desire that no personalities should be introduced into this debate, but that it should be carried on in the high and statesmanlike manner in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] carried it on, I would demonstrate to the Senator from Pennsylvania, by editorial utterances of the press of this country upon both sides of this question, what they think now and thought then as to who were obstructing legislation.

Mr. President, we understand the inception of this business; we understand how this thing—not how, but when, it was born. And we have beheld that strange creature before us ever since, not growing as most children grow, but rather diminishing, I am very glad to say. So that I am not so sure whether the Senator has his votes, of which he so earnestly and vigorously—and I could use another adjective—boasted at the end of the last session and has boasted ever since; and upon which votes has rested the Senator's chief argument.

That was the situation at the end of the last session. Now, what is the situation to-day? The Senator day after day—I had hoped he would not do it any more, but he did it again just as I was beginning to discuss this bill—has referred to the willful obstruction of legislation—and by us. That is not offensive to me, though sometimes I think perhaps those statements that the Senator's colleagues are willfully obstructing legislation, in view of the facts, is a little audacious. It reminds me of what Danton said to his followers: "Pour les vaincre il nous faut de l'audace, encore de l'audace, toujours de l'audace, et la France est sauvée"—"To overcome them we need only audacity, and again audacity, and always audacity, and France is saved." Mr. President, I have thought many times that I could imagine the Senator from Pennsylvania in the midst of the councils of his allies rising and saying to them, "Let us say we demand a vote; we care not for argument; we care not for investigation; we care not for information; all we need to overcome them is audacity, and again audacity, and always audacity, and the omnibus bill is saved!"

Mr. President, I do not think that that tactics, however potent it may be in convention halls, will work in the Senate of the United States.

I have been a reverent student, though I have no doubt not a profound one, of the discussions which gave rise to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States with respect to the establishment of the Senate in our scheme of government. I know what those great men, who saw further, perhaps, into the future than any statesman ever saw, thought and meant when they established the Senate of the United States and fixed its term of service and the manner of selecting Senators. Every precaution possible was thrown around this body in order to prevent just such tactics as that from prevailing.

Now, then, here is the situation: The Senator says, "I have the votes; I want a vote;" and even when a Senator is on his feet he says "I want a vote." With this array of votes—I trust and believe many of them have yielded to argument and new information—the Senator from Pennsylvania comes before the Senate of the United States and says, "Give us what we demand, or no legislation shall pass this body."

Obstructors of legislation! Mr. President, we are willing at any moment to take up any legislation; we are willing to pass appropriation bills; we are willing to take up the treaty; we are willing to take up trust legislation, Philippine legislation, pure-food legislation, labor legislation; in short, we are willing to take up anything which immediately affects the country's welfare, and which, if done now and unwisely done, we can undo at the next Congress. If the Senator is anxious to pass legislation which is blocked here by the situation which the Senator from Pennsylvania himself has created, let us agree to take up these other questions and pass them. But the burden is not upon us, Mr. President, nor shall it be permitted to rest upon our shoulders, that we obstruct because we debate a needful measure needfully.

"Let the galled jade wince, our withers are unwrung."

Let the Senate and the country understand what they do understand now, that the real obstructors of this legislation, if obstruction occurs, as it has not yet, are not those Senators who stand here in good faith and debate this measure, and who have debated it thus far much more briefly than any measure of like or even of half the importance has even been debated, but the Senator who, day by day, announces that he has got the votes and will pass this bill, or the country will not be permitted to have any other needful legislation at present.

Why is it, Mr. President, that we are willing to take up other



measures, and that we are willing only to debate this subject until debate shall be exhausted, until every Senator upon both sides of this Chamber shall have been heard by his associates and by the country? This is the reason: Because, Mr. President, if any other measure is passed which we find harmful to the country, that measure can be repealed by the next Congress; but if this measure should prove unwise—and at least there is a question of it since there is such a sharp and profound difference of opinion regarding it—and the Senator should succeed in passing it, it is a thing which is done forever, and even the Senator himself with all his votes could not undo it if he so willed. He would find it a Frankenstein, which would constantly grow and grow, and if it was in the end a mistake it would finally devour him. Therefore, is it unreasonable that men whose minds and consciences and all the elements that inspire public men to action compel them to be against this bill should do the very thing for which our States sent us here; that we should do the very thing for which this Senate was established in the first instance—discuss a measure until discussion has discovered its merits or demerits, until debate had sifted the dross from the gold, and until we were finally able to give by our votes an informed and intelligent opinion?

These reasons might appeal even to the Senator from Pennsylvania. And, if this is true, Mr. President, who is it that is obstructive—those who wish to do their duty or those who say "Give us a vote or you can not have any legislation?"

Since the Senator has raised the issue—and I did not expect to utter a word upon this question, because I knew how the country and the Senate felt about it—I knew how the country felt about it from those who have talked to me; I knew how the country felt about it from the editorials which have appeared in Republican papers, in Democratic papers, and in independent papers upon this very question which, if the Senator had any doubt about it, I would introduce if I had them here at this time were it not for the fact that, so far as I am concerned, personalities shall not enter into this debate—since, I say, the Senator has raised the question of obstruction, let the blame rest where it belongs.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say upon this question, which is an immediate question of great importance, I will admit. As to who is obstructing legislation and as to who will be responsible for the defeat of the country's much-needed laws, I think the country will understand; and if a brand is to be placed, I think the country will place the brand accurately where it belongs, nor do I think they will permit the Senator from Pennsylvania to divert that burning iron from its proper object.

Mr. President, in all I had intended to say in my very brief answer to some of the points made by the Senator from Ohio, I should not have occupied the time which the Senator from Pennsylvania has compelled me to occupy on this question of obstruction. And in view of the fact that I do not desire to trespass upon the time of my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM] longer than is necessary, I will proceed immediately, and as briefly as possible, to an examination of two or three statements which I think are proper to lay before the Senate in connection with the remarkably able and uncommonly high-of-tone argument of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] yesterday. I was very greatly impressed with it. I listened to it with admiration, because I admire the Senator as much as I deplore his position upon this question.

Mr. President, let us put the touchstone of the comparative facts to the vigorous argument of the Senator from Ohio, the second argument which has been made in behalf of the omnibus bill championed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I do not intend to go into a full discussion of the excellent speech of the Senator from Ohio, but I do intend at this particular time, because what he said so well is fresh upon the minds of all of us, to call attention to what seems to me to be an unintentional extravagance of expression. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the vigor of brilliant advocacy in which the Senator from Ohio found himself as he made his argument robbed his speech somewhat of its judicial nature.

The first thing to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 951, where I find this statement by the Senator from Ohio:

Mr. President, the Territory of Arizona had, according to the census of 1890, only 59,000 people in round numbers. According to this census she has a population of 122,000; and I do not think all were counted. But all might not have been counted before. Assuming that the census was right in both instances, what is the result? The population has grown—

And I beg attention of Senators to this—

The population has grown more than 100 per cent in ten years. How much would the Senator from Maine expect a population to grow in ten years to give a promise of growth in the ten years to come? Is there that growth in Maine? Is there that growth in Delaware? Is there that growth in Vermont, or New Hampshire, or Rhode Island, or Indiana? There is no such growth anywhere in the United States as there has been in the Territory of Arizona.

Mr. President, if that is true, it is a powerful argument to sustain the proposition that in Arizona, as was the case in Indiana

and Ohio and Iowa and Illinois and Missouri and other like States, there is an immediate natural assurance of an immense increase of population. But what are the facts? These are the facts: There is shown by the census of 1900 an increase of 100 per cent in the population of Arizona over the census of ten years before, because nearly 30,000 Indians were included in the last census that were not included in the previous census. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] nods his head. Does the Senator think that that is a fair method to compute an increase of population?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I did not nod my head.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he did.

Mr. FORAKER. Not in assent to the Senator's suggestion. I was nodding my head in assent to the information he was giving.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, in any event, here it is stated, and an argument of weight and eloquence built upon the statement, that there has been an astounding increase of population in Arizona; and when we come to apply to it the test of the comparative figures, we find that increase is accounted for in large part by the fact that some twenty-eight or thirty thousand Indians were not counted in the census ten years ago who were counted in the last census. Does that show a tide of immigration into Arizona from which the Senator draws his well-drawn inference upon the facts he states? I have no doubt perhaps that the Senator did not know that fact. Of course he did not know that fact. He goes on to state from that:

There is no such growth anywhere in the United States as there has been in the Territory of Arizona.

Well, let us see about that, Mr. President. The Senator was arguing at considerable length—and, of course, I do not want to take up very much time in calling attention to other statements, but that is the very heart and gist of them—that there was as great growth in the increased population of Arizona as there had ever been in any Territory of this country, certainly as there is now. Well, here is the statement from the census, not given in figures only, but in the language of the census report itself:

The population of the Territory of Arizona is 122,212 (final report 122,931), as compared with a population in 1890 of 59,620. This shows an increase during the decade of 62,592, or 104.9 per cent. This large increase is due in part to the fact that there were 23,469 Indians and 154 other persons, or a total of 23,623 persons, on Indian reservations, etc., in Arizona who were specially enumerated in 1890 under the provisions of the census act, but were not included in the general population of the Territory at that census. (Census of 1900, Bulletin No. 6, p. 1.)

Let us see, Mr. President, whether or not there has been as great growth anywhere else in the United States. At several places in his speech the Senator called my particular and personal attention to his statements, though that is never necessary in order that I shall give all my attention to the Senator whenever he speaks. He says:

There is no such growth anywhere in the United States as there has been in the Territory of Arizona.

I say that that was a statement made in the heat of advocacy, because here is the statement of the 1900 Census Population Report, volume 1, page xxvi:

Among the several States and Territories Oklahoma shows the largest percentage of increase since 1890. Oklahoma was organized as a Territory in May, 1890, and at the census taken one month later had a population of 78,475, including 16,641 Indians and other persons specially enumerated but not included in the general report on population at that census. At the census of 1900 it had a population of 308,331, or an increase since 1890 of 407.6 per cent; in other words, its population in 1900 is more than five times as large as the entire population returned in 1890.

And yet the Senator says that the increase in the population of Arizona, even counting Indians who had not been included before, is not equaled anywhere else in the United States, whereas Oklahoma, lying right next to it, within a stone's throw of it, geographically speaking, has an increase of over 407.6 per cent. Does that show that, with all our respect for the Senator, we must give very much consideration to any argument built upon that statement?

The latter part of the Senator's argument was based—

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator does not object to my interrupting him—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I yield to the Senator gladly, for I do not want to misrepresent him.

Mr. FORAKER. The statement made by me in a broad way should be modified. I did not think for the moment of the great and rapid growth of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory. I had in mind, when I was using the expression, the United States otherwise than in the Territories. Is there any State where there has been any such increase or any such percentage of increase as the census indicated, as I quoted the census, namely, 100 per cent?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course the Senator will modify his statement as to the 100 per cent now?

Mr. FORAKER. Of course I will have to modify it in view of what the Senator says, if the Senator is correct, as no doubt he is from what he says; but still the percentage would be—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Thirty-nine per cent.

Mr. FORAKER. How much?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Thirty-nine per cent.

Mr. FORAKER. No; it is an increase of over 57 per cent as the Senator gave the figures just now.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; perhaps it is.

Mr. FORAKER. Which shows that the increase of population in Arizona during the last decade was, according to the corrected figures as given by the Senator, more than 57 per cent. I doubt if there is any State in the Union that can show a like increase of population by percentage.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, then, Mr. President, that is a fair and frank modification. Let us put that to the touchstone. Is it not a better, because a more comparative and juster comparison of information elicited, to ask the question whether or not we can point to any Territory which for ten years before its admission showed a like increase. Because that comparison between a State and a Territory eliminates the very essential difference that the Senator argues about? I will give the Senator some figures upon that.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, the Senator must know that for the moment when I made that statement I did not have Oklahoma in mind. I had been discussing Oklahoma and calling attention to its tremendous growth. I was speaking of the United States for the moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, let us go ahead to some other States and see what their percentage of increase was before their admission. Let us take the Indian Territory, which shows an increase in the same time of 117 per cent—no; it is more than that. Let us take Washington, admitted November 2, 1889, with a population of 349,390 by the census of 1890. Ten years before, Washington had a population of 75,116, the percentage of increase being more than 450.

Let us take Nebraska—

Mr. FORAKER. Is that for the last decade?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; for the decade immediately before its admission.

Mr. FORAKER. From 1880 to 1890?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. FORAKER. Well, I was speaking of the last decade. I say, including the last decade there had not been in the United States—there may have been; I may have been in error in making the statement, and I should like to have the Senator tell me of some State in which there was an increase of more than 100 per cent in population.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I can not inform the Senator now, because I do not know. I did not intend to go into an extended argument upon the Senator's speech, or I would have had that. But I thought it would be a juster comparison in the Senator's argument to find out what was the percentage of increase in the other Territories that had been admitted as States during the decade immediately preceding their admission; because that is the situation in which Arizona is.

Mr. FORAKER. Of course, the Senator speaks advisedly—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not know about the other States.

Mr. FORAKER. But the statement I made was as to the last decade, for you can find numerous cases where a Territory being admitted to statehood had a rapid rush of population to it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Before admission?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; in some cases before, and in many cases immediately afterwards. I was simply speaking of the general growth of the country. Of course, I will correct the figures if the Senator thinks I am wrong.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think that is a fair interpretation of what I read of what the Senator says. Nevertheless, I think that the argument of comparison is better for Territories that were admitted as States, the increase for the decade immediately preceding, because that is what you are proceeding on in Arizona. I think the Senator will agree it is a fair interpretation to put upon it. As to the growth in the States, I do not know.

Nebraska was admitted March 1, 1867. By the nearest census, that of 1870, she had a population of 122,993. By the previous census, that of 1860, she had a population of 28,841. The percentage of increase was 450.

Montana was admitted November 2, 1889. By the nearest census, that of 1890, she had a population of 132,159. By the census of 1880 she had a population of 39,159. The percentage of gain was more than 350.

Minnesota was admitted May 11, 1858. The population by the nearest census, that of 1860, was 172,023. The population by the previous census, that of 1850, was 6,077. The percentage of gain was 2,800; and so on.

I am not pretending to speak accurately about the figures I am now going to quote, but I think, Mr. President, in even the little and overcrowded State of Delaware there was an increase of population, notwithstanding immigration from it of perhaps 10 per cent. The point is that there was no rush into this Territory, such as occurred in these other States, and such as was justly anticipated in the case of the Territories which were afterwards formed into the States of the Mississippi Valley—such as was the case in Nebraska, and Minnesota, and the Dakotas.

While I am on the question of Indians, I wish to call the Senator's attention to one fact. The Senator says that there was in the speech of the Senator from Minnesota a discrepancy; that the census showed so many Indians and that the Indian Department's enumeration showed so many more, and he said:

They missed that many (nearly 5,000) in trying to count a lot of Indians penned up on the reservations.

From that we are to infer, of course, that here are a large number of Indians penned up in a very small area. How small an area, Mr. President? These Indian reservations are only 26,397 square miles in area; and I ask the Senator whether he does not think it is a little bit harder to get Indians, most of whom do not even wear any civilized clothes or dress, in an area of 26,397 square miles, in the neighborhood of a third of the area of the whole Territory, than it is to get civilized people who are in towns, cities, and mining camps? So we see as to the accuracy of that.

While I am on this subject, I may quote from the census as to the population of Arizona. The total population of Arizona was 122,931. I call the attention of the Senate to these figures. Of this number there were whites 92,903, divided as follows: Native whites—native parents, 44,830; native whites—foreign parents, 25,678; foreign white, 22,395. So we have a total of foreign born and of foreign immigrants of nearly 48,000 out of this population of 122,000, of which, according to the Senator's own figures, nearly 30,000 were Indians untaxed. If you take out those two elements how much does it leave? There remains a colored population of 30,028, of which 1,848 are negroes, 1,419 Chinese, 281 Japanese, and 24,644 Indians untaxed, and Indians taxed, 1,836, making the total of the census figures.

One other point in the Senator's address. He speaks of the marvelous growth in the business activity of these two Territories, and again issues a challenge for us to show any portion of the United States with an equal number of people that surpasses the business activity of Arizona and New Mexico. He gives the post-office receipts here—

Mr. FORAKER. I said "similarly situated."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. "Similarly situated." That introduces an element into this discussion which is very—

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator does not want to misrepresent what I said?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not.

Mr. FORAKER. I was very careful in making that statement. I did not mean to compare the people in those Territories with an equal number of people in New York City or in some other city or situated as we are in this part of the country.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. "Similarly situated."

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator did say "similarly situated," but the question of the similarity of the situation is the crux of this whole business. "Similarly situated." I do not know whether or not the words "similarly situated" bear out the Senator's other statements concerning the natural advantages of New Mexico, because the Senator went much further than Governor Ross did some years ago in his remarkable report. The Senator stated in the course of his address that he doubted if there was hardly an acre of the Territory of New Mexico unfit for the uses of man. He made statements similar to the statements made in the report brought into the Senate by Mr. Faulkner some four or five years ago concerning Arizona, in which he said something to this effect: That no State in the Union had resources that equaled, or anything like equaled, those of the Territory of Arizona.

Now, Mr. President, I have prepared and will put in without reading, because I want to hurry on, a statement of the internal-revenue receipts and post-office receipts and their increase (because that is what the Senator from Ohio gave) as to New Mexico and Arizona on the one hand and some little towns throughout the country on the other hand. I will read one or two, in order that the Senator may see the comparisons. In 1890 New Mexico's post-office receipts were over \$45,000. In 1902 they were \$93,684.17. Now, let us see whether any other portion of the country can show equal results. The post-office receipts for the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., were, in 1890, \$48,912.53 and in 1902



they were \$145,030.97. That is a little city of perhaps one-fourth the population of New Mexico whose increase, Mr. President, is immensely above that of the entire Territory of New Mexico, with its vastly larger population.

Here are Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Guthrie, in Oklahoma Territory; Scranton, Pa. In 1890—I turn to the Senator from Pennsylvania—the Scranton post-office receipts were sixty-one thousand and some hundred dollars. In 1902 they were \$232,879; and perhaps the Senator from Pennsylvania can tell me what the population of Scranton is. I ask that the rest of this paper be inserted in my remarks without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the paper will be inserted in the RECORD.

The paper referred to is as follows:

*Internal-revenue receipts in some States and Territories.*

	1890.	1901.
New Mexico .....	\$37,671.19	\$58,609.31
Vermont .....	23,819.02	166,786.10
Washington .....	137,394.81	802,887.81
Montana .....	105,094.44	486,173.03
Utah .....	55,592.40	227,543.71
District of Columbia .....	169,957.33	790,986.96
Maryland .....	2,896,944.75	8,592,771.72
Rhode Island .....	273,858.11	1,287,035.61

  

	1892.	1901.
Arizona .....	\$17,965.90	\$61,608.96
Maine .....	39,855.48	286,581.33
Mississippi .....	31,014.21	94,901.48
Oklahoma .....	8,894.10	95,598.27
Indian Territory .....	5,738.41	26,789.17

Mr. BEVERIDGE. On post-office receipts the Senator said:

In 1890 New Mexico's post-office receipts were \$45,639.63, and in 1902 they were \$93,684.17.

Now, consider a few comparisons.

The post-office receipts for the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., were in 1890 \$48,912.53, and in 1902 were \$145,030.97.

The post-office receipts for the city of Elkhart, Ind., were in 1890 \$21,996.04, and in 1902 were \$74,856.58.

The post-office receipts for the Indian Territory were in 1890 \$3,348.85, and in 1902 were \$136,406.44.

The gross post-office receipts for Arizona in 1890 were \$28,416.06, and in 1902 were \$129,267.95.

Or take some Ohio towns and compare the increase of their post-office receipts with New Mexico's.

	1890.	1902.
Akron, Ohio .....	\$50,394.84	\$136,946.07
Springfield, Ohio .....	73,695.04	142,453.26

or consider the post-office receipts in the following places:

	1890.	1902.
Oklahoma .....		\$267,417.45
Oklahoma City .....		54,546.04
Guthrie .....		26,801.05
Scranton, Pa. ....	\$61,324.03	232,879.43
Allegheny, Pa. ....	68,467.86	213,022.19
Schenectady, N. Y. ....	19,284.33	112,000.67

I had marked in the Senator's instructive speech several other points to which I intended to call attention, but the time is going on, and I do not wish to consume more than I must, and so I will pass them over to some future time when I will try to give them further and more extended attention.

But there is one more thing to which I desire to call the Senate's attention before I conclude this afternoon, and that is as to the Senator's argument concerning the rule deduced by the committee from the ordinance of 1787. I think the Senator is right in his construction of that. I have examined it, and I make no quarrel on that. But in order to understand that we must understand some further facts to which no reference was made; and when these further facts are understood the Senate will see that after all the rule deduced by the committee is accurate for the purposes for which it was deduced.

Why did the committee refer to the fact that the fathers of the ordinance of 1787 fixed 60,000 as the number of people when, as the Senator says, a State might demand admission? Why did the committee refer to the unit rule of representation? Why did we refer to anything which went to show the opinion of any statesman in the past concerning how many people a State must have? It was because we wanted to show that a Territory claiming admission as a State must show some fair proportion of population to the population of the rest of the country.

We do not contend arbitrarily for the rule of 60,000 as applied to the population of the country to-day. We do not contend for the rule of the unit of representation arbitrarily. We contend for no arbitrary rule, but these things are used as illustrations to show that you can not rightfully admit a Territory which seeks admission as a State with a population of ten or fifteen or twenty or a hundred or five hundred, but it must bear some just and reasonable proportion to the rest of the Republic.

Mr. President, what were the circumstances which led to the proviso which the Senator read in the ordinance of 1787, to wit, that if at any time with a fewer number a Territory could be admitted consistently with the welfare of the country, it might be admitted? It was the fact that the first ordinance which Virginia presented to the Congress of the United States for the cession of the Northwest territory provided that instead of being five States, as was finally determined by the Congress of the United States, there should be ten, and that instead of 60,000 there should be 20,000. One of the reasons—and I will come to the other presently—why that proviso was put in was because the Congress of the United States rejected the first draft of the ordinance of Virginia, ceding the Territory to the United States, and providing for its government in 1787, which ordinance had in it a provision that 20,000 should be sufficient to admit a State into the Union. The Congress thought that was not enough. They thought that number was absurd, and so they fixed it at 60,000. But in view of 20,000 being fixed in the ordinance, they said "provided," and then follows the proviso referred to by the Senator from Ohio.

What was the other reason? It is a historical reason. It was the fact that those Territories were then being settled, and in Ohio at that time, or very soon thereafter, there were a large number of soldiers of the Revolution. Washington refers to them in one of his letters. He says in substance and effect:

"I know these men well. They were the men who helped establish the Constitution of the United States. They were the men who in the various colonies helped to ratify it by their votes."

Aye, Mr. President, those men who were going into those new States, and many of whom were there when the ordinance was passed, were the men who had first helped to unfurl our banner to the breeze and who had kept it there by baring their breasts in the front of battle. They were swarming over the mountains, they were filling the plains and the savannas of Ohio and Indiana and Illinois; and Washington, in speaking of them, said that in his opinion no colony had ever been established on earth under such favorable auspices or with such excellent material.

And so the two reasons for the proviso to which the Senator refers are that the ordinance of 1787, as presented by Virginia, contained a provision for 20,000, and the Congress of the United States thought it was absurd and fixed 60,000. Even Thomas Jefferson, with all his enormous power over Congress—a very proper power it was, too—could not force that ordinance through. The Congress returned it. The ordinance first presented to Congress provided for ten States out of the Northwest territory instead of five, as finally adopted. The Congress of the United States thought that even coming from that great statesman it was absurd, and they reduced it. First the proposition was to reduce to two States all of the territory now constituting Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and finally it was not less than three nor more than five.

The first draft of the ordinance of Virginia contained ten States and their names were as follows: *Sylvania, Michigan, Cheronesus, Assenisipia, Metropotamia, Illinois, Saratoga, Washington, Polypotamia, Pelisipia*. Those were the States Virginia first proposed. That was the ordinance as presented. The Senator might have stated those facts. They were fair facts as showing the reason why they put in that proviso.

Now, the purpose of the committee, as stated in our report, in referring to the rule established in the ordinance of 1787 and in referring to the other rules was to show that it is submitted to the good sense of Congress that there must be some fair proportion of population in a Territory seeking admission to the Union compared to the rest of the population of the nation.

Mr. President, just one other point, and I am through. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] several times, in language as harsh as the language of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], in referring to the same point yesterday, was respectful and considerate to his associates, has referred to the Republican platform, and time and again we who are honored by belonging to that great party have been belabored with the Territorial plank in the platform of 1900. It has been wielded by a masterful hand, but the whip was not very effective. We were in the position of a man being thrashed with a straw in the hands of a giant as I shall show in a moment.

Mr. President, to what extent do party platforms bind the mind and conscience of United States Senators? I think we all agree—I do not think there will be any disagreement upon this side of the

Chamber nor upon my own side of the Chamber with this statement—that a party platform is binding as to laws upon which we as Senators are called on to vote when they involve an issue of which the convention that adopted it knew, of which the people were informed by discussion, and upon which they voted at the polls. You can not by implication say, as you would in a lawsuit, that because it is in a platform therefore the delegates must be held to know it was there. The rule of legal implication does not rest upon the voters of the United States if they never had it in mind at all. We are not bound here, in voting upon questions, by the narrow rules of legal interpretation that are invoked in court. These are great questions of public policy.

Now, I think everybody will agree, as a matter of common sense, that a party platform ought to be binding upon us in the votes we shall give upon a great measure before us when the utterances of that platform states an issue which was debated before the people and which was voted upon by the people and which was decided by the people. As, for example, could any Republican Senator, with any possible self-respect, have voted against the principles of the protective tariff or the gold standard or any other question which constituted an issue in this campaign or in any campaign? No. I say that, Mr. President, notwithstanding that I have in mind the fact that when the Constitution was adopted the political party, as we understand it to-day, did not exist; and that a party convention in this country was not called for nearly a half century after the Constitution was adopted, and that party platforms did not lay down the law to the Senate of the United States or the Congress of the United States for nearly a half century after the Constitution was adopted and this Congress had been in operation.

I state that by party platforms we, as honorable men, are bound, when acting as Senators of the United States upon great issues that the people understand, notwithstanding the fact that one of the chief reasons, argued and argued again by those who had to do with the establishment of the Senate, was that it should be so constituted as to put a modifying and a moderating check upon temporary expressions of popular will. But if there is an issue here, then we are bound by it.

Was there then any issue on statehood? Was there a speech made upon the subject? In the address of the permanent or of the temporary chairman of the convention was the question mentioned? Was it talked about even in the lobbies of hotels where delegates gathered?

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. The Senator, as I understand him, says there was no issue between the two parties, and that this question was not discussed—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. In either the Republican or the Democratic convention in fixing the platforms.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not say it, but I do say it now.

Mr. CLAY. Then I call the Senator's attention to the platforms of the two political parties in 1888.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was myself going to do that.

Mr. CLAY. Just one minute. I want to call the Senator's attention to the resolution that was passed on June 6, 1888, at the time Mr. Cleveland was nominated for President and Allen G. Thurman for Vice-President. The national Democratic convention was the first in that year to make nominations.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What year was that?

Mr. CLAY. Eighteen hundred and eighty-eight. The resolution provides:

That a just and liberal policy should be pursued in reference to the Territories; that right of self-government is inherent in the people and guaranteed under the Constitution; that the Territories of Washington, Dakota, Montana, and New Mexico are by virtue of population and development entitled to admission into the Union as States, and we unqualifiedly condemn the course of the Republican party in refusing statehood and self-government to their people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. CLAY. Now, one minute.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, well; you denounced us in 1900.

Mr. CLAY. The Republican convention met seven or eight days after this platform was adopted by the Democratic convention; and the Republican convention, in enunciating its platform in 1888, provided:

The Republican party pledges itself to do all in its power to facilitate the admission of the Territories of New Mexico, Wyoming, Idaho, and Arizona to the enjoyment of self-government as States.

Now, I want to ask the Senator, is it not true that the Democratic convention convened on the 5th day of June, in 1888, and provided in their platform for the admission of these Territories and condemned the Republican party for failing to carry out its pledges, and that the Republican convention convened seven or eight or ten days afterwards and unanimously indorsed a platform which provided for the admission of those Territories?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator say we are bound by the platform of 1888? Why does the Senator resort to ancient history? We have had later conventions.

Mr. CLAY. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the planks of the platforms of the conventions which convened in 1892 and 1896 and 1900, having reference to these Territories, provide for their admission as States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In practically the same language?

Mr. CLAY. Not exactly in the same language, but practically in the same language.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will put the question to the test, and I will ask the Senator from Georgia this question. He is a prominent Senator and one of the leaders of his party, as everybody admits, and an honorable gentleman. I want to ask the Senator this question: Did the Senator know the language of the Democratic platform itself, adopted at the last national convention, before he looked it up in the book at this session?

Mr. CLAY. I desire to say to the Senator from Indiana—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What was it? Can the Senator quote it?

Mr. CLAY. Not exactly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No.

Mr. CLAY. But I know the substance of it. I desire to say to the Senator that I read every word and line in the platforms of 1888, of 1892, of 1896, and of 1900.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator state what was the substance of the last platform?

Mr. CLAY. I can give—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; do not look at the book. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLAY. Do you mean in the platform of the late Democratic convention?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes, sir. What was its substance?

Mr. CLAY. In substance, the platform of the last Democratic convention provided for the early admission of these Territories to statehood. I want to say this to the Senator—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Hold on! The Senator does not state it nearly so strong as it was. Your platform provided for the immediate, not the early, admission of the Territories, and you further denounced our perfidy in not admitting them. I will ask the Senator if he made one single speech upon that subject or uttered one word on that subject in any of his speeches?

Mr. CLAY. I did not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No.

Mr. CLAY. I did not believe it was an issue between the two political parties. When the Republican convention assembled, representing at that time probably a majority of the people of the United States, and announced that that convention, representing the Republicans, was in favor of the admission of those Territories as States, and when a Democratic convention did likewise, I believed there was no issue between the two parties, and we turned our attention to the discussion of questions as to which there were issues. We believed that platforms meant what they said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I know—

Mr. CLAY. And there was no difference between the two parties on this question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then why did the Senator's platform denounce us for bad faith? If you did not mean to denounce us, why did you put it in? And if you did put it in, why did you not speak about it?

Mr. CLAY. Because you had not kept your promise.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Why did you not speak about it to the people as an issue?

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me to ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he feels bound by all the provisions of all the Democratic platforms since 1888?

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether the Republican party has carried out any portion of the platform that it provided in 1900?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is a counterclaim. It is a plea of confession and avoidance.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator this—

Mr. ALDRICH. I answer that I have to confess that I have never read the Republican platform of 1900.

Mr. CLAY. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that the Republican platform of 1900 provided for the admission of these Territories as States. It provided that there should be a remedy for the evils existing by reason of the trusts now in this country, and the Senator knows there has been no effort upon the part of Congress to carry out either of those provisions in the platform of 1900.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have had more or less experience and knowledge as to how platforms are constructed both by Democratic conventions and Republican conventions, and I must confess that



that knowledge and that experience rather lessens my loyalty to their provisions.

Mr. CLAY. I did not catch that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator from Georgia will permit me, I will proceed. I am always glad to yield, and I am very much obliged for his interruption, because he always illuminates any subject to which he addresses himself.

He says he did not denounce us, although the platform did, because he thought there was no issue, although the platform denounced us because it thought there was an issue. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] suggests to me that they had become so accustomed to denouncing us that they had to pen a denunciation anyhow.

I ask the Senator's attention to this particular point. Let us agree, then, that there was in the campaign of 1900 no issue between the two parties (although the platform of one convention denounced the other party) because both substantially agreed upon the same thing. Very well. One session of Congress was held after 1900. This was in 1902. This bill was up, as it was claimed, in accordance with the provisions of both platforms. A very stubborn committee, even under the lashing of the party whip by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], failed to make its report. We were denounced upon this floor as having gone back upon the expressions of our platform. Between the time that Congress adjourned and the time when it reconvened there was a campaign through all this country. There was the opportunity for an outraged people to rise and denounce in their wrath the party which had deceived them. There was an opportunity for the Senator from Georgia to unloose the flood gates of his eloquence in denunciation of that act of political perfidy.

Now, did the Senator from Georgia do it? Did the Senator from Georgia, during the campaign of 1902, make a remark before any of his audiences upon the question of the admission of the Territories?

Mr. CLAY. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that the Senator's party in its previous platform had promised that it would admit these Territories to statehood. They did not do it. They came back and made another promise.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. When?

Mr. CLAY. You made a promise. You promised—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. When?

Mr. CLAY. In 1888.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, 1888.

Mr. CLAY. You made a promise in 1892.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Where did we make a promise in 1892?

Mr. CLAY. In the convention which named the candidates for President and Vice-President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In 1902?

Mr. CLAY. In 1892.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am stating the Senator's position logically and frankly. The Senator says there was substantially no issue between the parties in 1900 because their two platforms, after all, substantially agreed. I point out to the Senator, then, that notwithstanding our platform, we did not admit those States in the last session, immediately after the campaign of 1900, and after that and before the present session there intervened a political campaign in which the Senator from Georgia took a part. We had then, according to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators who take that position, violated our platform prior to the campaign of 1902. Now, then, did the Senator from Georgia make a single speech or give utterance to a single sentence in any speech with respect to that neglect of duty on our part? There was an issue according to your position in the last campaign after we had not fulfilled, as you say, our platform pledges of 1900. Why did you not avail yourself of it?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Indiana a fact with which he is probably familiar. It is not proper to refer to what has occurred in the House, but I will state that my understanding is that the House of Representatives went so far as to pass this bill providing for statehood—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CLAY. Just one moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly—two minutes.

Mr. CLAY. Carrying out the platform of the Republican party. I understand that a bill for the admission of New Mexico has passed six different times in the House. It has been reported three different times in the Senate. A political party may meet in convention and promulgate a platform and be unable to get its measures through Congress by reason of the pressure of other business, notwithstanding the fact that the platform provides for such legislation. I understand, I will say to the Senator, that

there have been four different reports made by the Committee on Territories in the Senate in favor of the admission of New Mexico to statehood.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes, and some day I intend to examine the statements in those reports, too, because it was probably those reports that the committees on resolutions of the two parties had before them when they enunciated these planks. But the Senator does not answer my question. It is no answer to say that the House passed this measure. Does the Senator consider himself bound to vote for a bill because the House passes it? If so, we had better have only one House. Mr. Conkling made the observation in debate on the floor of the Senate, and Mr. Thurman seconded his remark, that if we were to consider ourselves bound to pass a bill because the House had passed it, we might as well have only one House.

Is there any weight to the argument of the Senator from Georgia? I put the question again to the Senator from Georgia. It takes the two Houses to pass a measure in this Government. Having violated the platform pledges of 1900, as the Senator says, by not passing this measure at the last session of Congress (because the Senator from Pennsylvania said they had the votes to pass it and therefore our failure to pass it must have been a violation of our platform, according to the Senator from Georgia) having done that, having failed to keep that platform pledge, the campaign came on in which the Senator from Georgia took part. Did he mention in any one of his speeches that failure on the part of the Republican party? I pause for a reply. The Senator does not answer.

I thought perhaps the Senator from Tennessee, whom I see there, my good friend, and able and brilliant Senator, might have done so. I happen to know—

Mr. CARMACK. Will the Senator repeat what he said?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Do not interrupt me until I conclude what I am going to say about the Senator, which I assure him will always be agreeable.

Mr. CARMACK. Is the Senator speaking of me or of my colleague?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I include both; but I was particularly speaking of the handsome, young, and brilliant Senator who just arose to address me, and whose consciousness of the fact that he was addressed led him to arise and make the inquiry.

I happen to know that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] had a great deal to do with the management of the last Democratic campaign of 1902, and in that good humor which always distinguishes his contests he baited us a good deal in private conversation about violating this platform. So he went into the preparation of the campaign book, which I have here on my desk, with full knowledge that here was this party simply filled with perfidy upon this question in not having done it. He was making an issue, in helping to make this campaign book, for his party before the people. The Senator can tell us, and I pause for a reply, whether he put one word in the campaign book of 1902, or whether any of his associates did, concerning this violation of the platform pledge by the Republican party.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, it was impossible to insert in that campaign book the various infidelities of the Republican party. We found that they were as numberless as the sands of the sea.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, Mr. President, there is a moderate statement for you.

Mr. CARMACK. It was impossible for us to include them in any one book of reasonable size. We had to omit a great many.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So the Senator omitted this one, and the Senator confined his opportunity—

Mr. BATE. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion there?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am always delighted to hear the Senator.

Mr. BATE. For this very statehood bill the Republicans of the House had voted before the election.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Why, Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania got up here and claimed with a good deal of vigor that we were not carrying out our platform pledges. He read the whole proceedings of that convention. He read the names of those of us who had been there, and he held us up to public scorn, if we did not pass this omnibus measure right then and there.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Wait a minute. Yet, Mr. President, in spite of that fact, in spite of that appeal by the able and influential Senator from Pennsylvania to his party colleagues, coupled with the suggestion to them that they were not carrying out their party platform, in spite of giving that ammunition to the enemy during the campaign, there was not a word said about it even in the Democratic campaign book prepared by the vigilant and handsome and able young Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. Is it not true that the bill we are now considering, this bill providing for the admission of these three Territories to statehood, passed the House previous to the last campaign in the United States between the parties—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. Practically without any opposition; and it came to the Senate, and had been referred to the Committee on Territories?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. And is it not true that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania had moved to discharge the committee?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He had, much to my regret.

Mr. CLAY. I understand that. I am not surprised that you regret it. I have seen every evidence of that that I possibly could for the last two or three months.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; not so much as you did at the time.

Mr. CLAY. I wish to say to the Senator that the Senate, both sides of the Chamber, agreed, and the motion to discharge the committee was not pressed to a vote. The Senator from Indiana resisting it, and the Senator from Pennsylvania insisting upon it, both sides agreed that this measure should be taken up early in the present session, I believe the third or fourth day of the session. I am not certain as to the date. Is it not true?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; that is not true. The agreement was that the report should be made.

Mr. CLAY. On the tenth. Is it not true that the bill was to be taken up then and passed upon—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No.

Mr. CLAY. And did not the Senator from Indiana and those associated with him—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. How many questions is the Senator going to ask?

Mr. CLAY. I am going to ask some that the Senator can not answer, I think.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator's questions are like the shot from a mitrailleuse or a Gatling gun—they come so thick and fast. I have to pick out his questions and—

Mr. CLAY. The trouble is that the Senator says no without even waiting to know what I am going to ask him.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know what you have asked. Nobody can tell what the Senator is going to ask.

Mr. CLAY. There was no issue between the two parties so far as the action of Congress was concerned at the last session. Is it not true that both parties agreed to take this matter up on the 10th of December and discuss it, and that the bill came here late in the session, and it was not really an issue between the two parties at the last session?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I hope the Senator will read the RECORD to-morrow, and he will find that he has put to me ten or fifteen questions without giving me a chance to answer any one of them.

Mr. President, I direct the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the question put to me by the Senator from Georgia. As near as I can remember the last section of it—it goes like trains on the Pennsylvania Railroad when it has heavy traffic, in sections—it was that both parties agreed to take the bill up and dispose of it. I had hoped that we might take it up and dispose of it, but the Senator at the beginning of my remarks this afternoon indicated that he wanted a vote without any discussion. Does the Senator from Georgia agree that we shall discuss it now?

Mr. CLAY. As I said to the Senator, every Senator in this Chamber is entitled to discuss a question under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course.

Mr. CLAY. I believe the Senator from Minnesota has discussed the bill for a week.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And very ably.

Mr. CLAY. And any other Senator may discuss it for a week who wants to do it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Minnesota discussed it very ably, and I am very glad to receive, as I was sure I should, the adherence of the Senator from Georgia to the ancient and venerable rule of the Senate which keeps it to-day the only arena of free speech left on this earth.

Now, Mr. President, as a matter of fact, in answer to the Senator's other questions, so far as I can gather them all together (because they came like a flight of arrows, and a man must put up his shield and get their general force, he can not get their specific intent, and purport) I must say no, it was not agreed; on the contrary, it was stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania that we were not carrying out our party pledge; and that statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania was highly enjoyed by his allies upon this side of the Chamber, although not all on this side are his allies now I hope, and consternation was thrown into the midst of those of us who are always inspired by great fear when any-

thing comes from any one of those two sources about our party policies.

Now, that denunciation was made. It was stated in private conversation, perhaps in jest, upon this side of the Chamber that we were going back upon our party platform. It was stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania that if the bill did not pass then, in his judgment it never would pass; and I think his judgment was most excellent upon that question at that time.

So there was an issue presented to the parties. Now, Mr. President, we come to the campaign that immediately followed and we find that not a speech was made upon it, not even by the eloquent Senator from Georgia. I myself took some part in that campaign, and for a long period. I met a very large number of speakers belonging to our party, both old and young, and talked with them about the subjects which should be discussed before the people. Not one word was said on either side, so far as I ever heard or read—and I was an attentive reader of the daily literature during that campaign—upon this outrage which we were perpetrating in violating our own pledges. Not one word was uttered by the eloquent Senator from Georgia. Not one word was uttered or written by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK], whose alertness and vigilance for the interests of his party are almost abnormal, and he deserves credit for that. He went to New England and all but prevented a unanimous Republican majority up there by speeches devoted to the subject of imperialism, but not one word did he utter upon our bad faith toward the Territories.

Here, Mr. President, are the campaign books. Here is the national Democratic campaign book for 1900, in which you denounce us for not having kept our pledges; and yet, notwithstanding the fact that we were denounced, notwithstanding the book is, as you see, a volume of considerable size, notwithstanding the fact that every issue before the people was exhaustively discussed, in this campaign book which went to the party speakers in order to give them information and in order to guide them upon what they should speak upon before the people, not one word is uttered in this about what you in your platform say is our perfidy in not admitting these States.

I say, "not one word," Mr. President. I will take that back. In reading it over I found there was one man who was sufficiently awake to the enormity of our position. I see that there was one master of vigilance who did detect us, and that was the only thing of the kind in this book of several hundred pages closely printed. That was Mr. RICHARDSON, the present leader of the Democratic side of the House, who, as I understand, is in some straits on account of his leadership now. He said in making his speech on this subject that we declared in our platform in favor of doing this and we had not done it; and then the imaginative mind of the Democratic leader in the House foresaw that we were actually going to erect a tariff wall between this country and the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona.

That fantastic speculation, Mr. President, is the only thing which the Democratic campaign book of 1900 indulges itself in upon this question of the Republicans not having lived up to their platform. Here is all there is on the subject—four short lines. Mr. RICHARDSON says:

Under the wicker rule of law as now applied by the Republican party in some of our Territories they may at an early date find erected between themselves and the balance of the Union a tariff wall which will serve to pauperize them while it enriches others.

And that was the extent of the Democratic statesmanship before the people concerning the nonadmission of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma. Was an issue then discussed before the people in 1900 and voted upon by them?

Here is the Republican campaign book for 1900. There is not a word in it upon the subject. Here is the Republican campaign book for 1902, after we had failed to pass this bill, and there is not one word in it upon the subject. Here is the Democratic campaign book for 1902, which my friend, the junior Senator from Tennessee, helped prepare, and there is not one word in it upon this subject.

Mr. President, I defy any Senator upon the other side of this question to find a single newspaper in the United States outside of the Territories themselves or neighboring States which discussed this measure before the people either in the campaigns of 1900 or 1902. I defy him to find a single speaker who addressed himself to this subject. If it was not argued before the people, if it was not discussed in the press, if it was not mentioned even in the Democratic and Republican campaign text-books, was there an issue presented? Did the people vote upon the question at either of those elections?

They had the opportunity, Mr. President. Most of the Republican platforms of the States were adopted after we adjourned, after we had committed this repeated perfidy in not living up to our platform. There was certainly an opportunity—nay, more,



there was an occasion—for the Republican party throughout the United States at least to call attention to the fact that we had not done what we had promised and they wanted us to give it attention. Well, here is the list of them. I will not read them over again, because not one single platform, with one exception, to which I will call attention, and I wish the Senator from Washington [Mr. FOSTER] was here to hear me, had a word in it about the admission of the Territories, and that, too, in spite of the fact that this was the only one of our campaign pledges that we had not attempted to carry out, but, on the contrary, had stood in the way of.

Now, all the rest of them were silent upon the subject. Not one of the States of the Union in Republican convention assembled in 1902 had a word to say upon the subject. Does that look as though it was upon the minds of the people? Does that look as though it was a larger committee, as the Senator from Pennsylvania said at the last session, "the electorate of the American people" who had passed upon this question? Does it look as though it was in the minds of the people? And if it was not, was it an issue? And if it was not an issue is it binding upon us here, especially when since then an investigation has been held?

Now, Mr. President, the only exception to this that I have been able to find (and if hereafter anybody finds I have made an error about it I hope they will call my attention to it) was the State of Washington, whose Republican platform was adopted September 10, 1902. It says:

We favor the admission of those Territories now seeking admission into the Union when they shall have become as populous as was the State of Washington when admitted.

I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania is willing to have the Senator from Washington controlled by his platform pledge, the writing of which I think the Senator from Washington knew something about? If so, we will have to wait until New Mexico and Arizona each have nearly 349,000 people.

Now, Mr. President, if it was an issue in the last campaign, surely the Republican Congressional campaign secretary would know it. I thought perhaps I had overlooked some fact. If it was a question upon which people were electing Congressmen, and to which their attention had been specifically called, because the fight involved by the attempt to discharge the Committee on Territories had gone broadcast throughout the country and was before those conventions, the secretary of the Republican campaign committee would know it. So I asked him for a written statement upon that subject, and here it is:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1903.

Hon. A. J. BEVERIDGE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In answer to your communication of this date I am pleased to advise you that during the campaigns of 1898, 1900, and 1902, Hon. J. W. BABCOCK was chairman and I was secretary of the national Republican Congressional committee. Together with our associates, we conducted the Congressional campaigns of those years. In such conduct we had correspondence and conferences with the various Congressional organizations throughout the country and with gentlemen who accepted assignments for speaking under our management. In neither one of these campaigns was the question of statehood of the Territories considered in any such correspondence or conference with either officers of organizations or speakers, nor was such subject regarded by any of us as an issue in either one of said campaigns.

During the campaign of 1902 I began the compilation of the platforms of the different parties adopted by the various State conventions, primarily with the view of publishing the same in pamphlet form. I abandoned the plan before I had secured a great many copies of such platforms. My recollection is that I secured and read platforms adopted by both parties in fifteen or twenty of the States. There was no allusion to the statehood question in either one of the platforms in the fifteen or twenty States which I examined.

Believing that this letter contains the information you have requested, I remain,

Yours, respectfully,

JESSE OVERSTREET.

So we find, Mr. President, that in the campaign of 1900 and in the campaign of 1902—

Mr. QUAY. Will the Senator from Indiana permit me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. QUAY. The reason, I suggest to the Senator from Indiana, why there was no debate upon the statehood question during the last campaign or in other previous campaigns was that the position of the two great parties was identical upon the subject. There was no necessity for going to the people about it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I said that was undoubtedly an excuse for 1900, but the Senator himself called attention to the fact that, unless we passed his bill at the end of the last session, we were violating the platform of our party, and, therefore, the conventions held after that had had their attention called specifically to that fact. Yet they did not put a word in their platforms concerning it. So there was the issue presented. We were standing here at that time, as the Senator said, opposing it. As a matter of fact we had not made up our minds to oppose it until after the investigation. If we violated our pledge, as the Senator from

Pennsylvania said last June, why did not a single Republican State convention say a word about it? Why did no speaker or newspaper discuss it?

Now, Mr. President, I think it very useful that this question has come up, because it shows that in adopting political platforms, as in all other business, public and private, greater care should be used. We should devote our political efforts to practical matters, but to ideals as well, Mr. President. The party which is not practical is ineffective; but the party whose purposes are not inspired by ideals is dead. Let us take a lesson from this, and in our conventions of both parties quit accommodating delightful gentlemen on side issues, and with the accuracy of conservatism pronounce for the welfare of the nation according to the facts, or, if we are in doubt of the facts, let us be silent upon them. Whatever others may do we can not afford to play politics. It is a game at which we have never won, and can not win, and never will win. Our strength and our glory and our victory heretofore have been in adherence to and the maintenance of principle and right.

Now, then, how was it that the platform of 1900 differed from the platform of 1896? The platform of 1896 was singularly statesmanlike, and it was as follows:

We favor the admission of the remaining Territories at the earliest practicable date, having due regard to the interests of the people of the Territories and of the United States.

Is there anything objectionable to any open mind in those two limitations, "having due regard to the interests of the people of the Territories and of the United States?" That was the first McKinley platform, and I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as I would call the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] if he were here, to the fact that that language was evidently used by a man who was a lawyer, because it is substantially taken from one of the great writers upon our Constitution, who says that "the government of Territories and all things concerning them, in so far as Congress has anything to do with them, shall be done having due regard to the interests of the people of the Territories and of the United States."

Now, that was the platform of 1896, upon which William McKinley became President the first time. Is it not a sane, wise, and conservative utterance? Why should any person object to those two provisions? And yet in the convention of 1900 we find the following. I can not explain it; perhaps the Senator from Pennsylvania can explain it.

We favor the home rule for, and the early admission to statehood of, the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

Leaving out the two statesmanlike provisions, whose presence certainly could not injure any just cause, but whose presence might prove an obstruction to any bill that anybody might attempt to rush through Congress.

Mr. QUAY. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. QUAY. I think, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] was the chairman of the subcommittee of the committee on resolutions who drafted that, and he can probably furnish the Senator from Indiana the information he requires.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I should be glad to have it from any source, Mr. President. I want to know the reason for omitting that. Did they have as full information as we have now? Did they have different information from that which was had by the platform committee of 1896? If they had different information, what was it? The only information that was had in 1896 and in 1900 were the reports from the governors of Territories and the statements made in the various Senate committee reports that had heretofore been presented to the Senate.

At some future time, when I come to examine that subject, I will demonstrate to the Senator's own satisfaction how grotesque, inaccurate, and absurd many of the fundamental statements of those Senate reports to this body were. Did you have any additional information? Was there any difference in the information before the committee in 1896 and the committee in 1900? I merely call attention to this because I think that both parties on side issues, the party of my friends over here as well as our own, and every other party should, upon minor details of a platform be as careful as they are upon great fundamental questions of the platform.

There is too much of a disposition, and has been in the past (now happily growing less as the accuracy of method in all matters all over the world increases) to oblige gentlemen whom you like—and many of us like very much, indeed, the gentlemen who are urging the passage of this bill—upon matters upon which we are uninformed and upon which we think it does not make very much difference anyhow. There has been too much of a disposition to say to friends, "Oh, well, we will put it in. It don't

amount to anything." And the public does not pay any attention to it and then it turns out that it does amount to something after all.

Now, the question is whether, that being the case, when new information has come before this body, when earnest and vigorous investigation has been had, when a volume of testimony for the first time in the history of the discussion of this question has been laid before the Senate of the United States, we are to be bound by that incidental utterance, which leaves out the two wise and statesmanlike provisions of preceding platforms, which even then did not become an issue either in the campaign of 1900 or the campaign of 1902.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question for information?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I desire to ask the Senator whether he does not think those words are necessarily implied?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, that is a new and most illuminative thought. I do think so. I never thought of it before, but that only illustrates the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin thinks of many things that many of us never thought of before; but I think so.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not ask the Senator for compliments. I wanted information.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am bound to give the Senator a compliment whenever I answer him, if I tell the truth.

Mr. President, I am not going to detain the Senate any longer. I am perfectly amazed that I have detained it so long. I simply wish to say on this question, let us be true to the traditions of this Senate, and, instead of attempting to throttle, let us encourage free discussion. It is that upon which the usefulness of the Senate depends. It was for that, among other things, and principally for that, that this Senate was constituted as a part of our system of government.

I beg that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is a very great reader, as everybody knows, will read the entertaining and instructive utterances of the great constructive statesman who placed the Senate of the United States in our scheme of government. He will find, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, that in terms of office, in the methods of selection, in the times of going out, keeping a continuous body here all the time, the very purpose of the ordination of this great and exalted body was that we should have free and untrammelled discussion of every issue, great and small, to the end that even the temporary passions of the people, as some of the greatest of our statesmen—Madison and Hamilton and others—stated, should be checked, until their sober second thought should clarify the situation, and that upon all questions nothing should be rushed through until it had been given the best thought, under his oath, of every Senator who stands here representing not only his State, but representing the United States. For the Senator here is not the Senator of Pennsylvania or the Senator of Indiana; he is the Senator of the United States from Pennsylvania or Indiana, and the welfare of the nation is as dear to us, and we speak as much for it as we do for that of our own States. But for whomever we speak, it was the purpose of the establishment of this great body that we should do the very thing the Senator from Pennsylvania now objects that we shall do.

Mr. President, let it be understood that utterances unwise and uninformed even of party platforms shall not suppress the mind and conscience of the American Senate; let it be understood that convention methods shall not prevail in this historic and exalted body; let the confidence of the American people in their Senate, the greatest legislative body in the world, as we have so proudly said, be renewed and reestablished and revitalized by our action upon this measure—the action of a Senate untrammelled by private pledges made to some other Senator before investigation, the action of a Senate unawed by combinations or by threats—the action of a Senate brave and true and free and worthy of the great purposes of its great founders.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President—

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. QUAY. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to address the Senate?

Mr. CLAY. I do not; I simply desired to ask the Senator from Indiana a question before he took his seat.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I believe the Senator from Indiana is perfectly familiar with this legislation, and I desire to ask the Senator this question: The bill providing for the admission of these three Territories to statehood passed the House at the last session and came to the Senate a few weeks before it adjourned?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. And went to the Committee on Territories?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. And there had been no report made by the Committee on Territories at the time we adjourned?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No.

Mr. CLAY. And there never had been any adverse report on the bill providing for the admission of these three Territories at the time we adjourned?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No.

Mr. CLAY. So there was no issue between the two parties at that time?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the way the Senator construes it. As I have pointed out, I fear with the monotony of iteration, notice was served most conspicuously upon the Republican party and the Democratic party throughout the nation by the Senator from Pennsylvania in his very forceful remarks, in which he arraigned all of us who were members of that convention, that it was necessary that we should pass this bill; and he stated if it did not pass then, in his judgment, it would never pass. I say notice was thus served, because it went out in all the papers of the United States that something of this kind was going on here, and there was an opportunity for both parties to express themselves in their platforms in last fall's campaign.

Mr. RAWLINS. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that his party had already violated its promise to admit these Territories before the adjournment of Congress, and that the Democrats were derelict during the last campaign in failing to charge the Republicans with that violation?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not know what the Senator understands; but if he understands that to be my statement, the Senator does not display great understanding at all, because, of course, I never said anything of the kind. The Senator, as a matter of fact, is trying to do one of those pleasant things he indulges in and put his conclusions in my mouth. Of course I decline to permit him to do so.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I now recur to the proposition I was about to submit to the Senate during the absence of the present occupant of the chair, for the fixing of a day upon which a final vote upon this question may be taken. I have one or two propositions to make that will occupy the time of the Senate but a moment or two, and then the discussion may proceed.

I first ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that a final vote may be taken on the pending bill on Saturday, the 24th instant.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At what hour?

Mr. QUAY. I have not fixed the hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the final vote on this bill, on the then pending amendments, and amendments then offered shall take place on Saturday—

Mr. QUAY. The 24th instant, I will say, at 2 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the 24th of January, at 2 o'clock p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. QUAY. Then I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the final vote be taken on Friday, the 30th instant, a week later, at the same hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the final vote on this bill, on the then pending amendments, and amendments then offered, may be taken on Friday, the 30th instant, at 2 o'clock p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will state in reference to that series, and any similar series of requests, that, of course, at this stage—

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator from Indiana says that, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania has not observed that for that day a special order has been assigned.

Mr. QUAY. What is the order?

Mr. LODGE. Eulogies on the late Senator McMillan.

Mr. QUAY. That is on February 4, I understand.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the Senator named January the 30th.

Mr. QUAY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Well, that is the date fixed for eulogies on the late Senator McMillan.

Mr. QUAY. Then I will say on Saturday, the 31st of January.

Mr. LODGE. We have a special order also for that day. Special orders have been fixed for both days named by the Senator.

Mr. QUAY. Then, Mr. President, I will say on Thursday, the 29th instant.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will say with reference to the entire series—

Mr. QUAY. I will deliver the series first, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Did you not propose a date?

Mr. QUAY. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Did you expect me to say anything on it or not?



Mr. QUAY. No, but I expect the Senate probably to give unanimous consent to vote on that day.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then your expectations will be, like some other great expectations, unfulfilled.

Mr. SPOONER. I hope the Senator from Indiana will allow the Senator from Pennsylvania to read his schedule without interruption.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All right. That is correct. I am willing to listen to the Senator's schedule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the last request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask the Senator to complete his schedule, but it must not be taken for granted that any part of his schedule is agreed to until he gets through with the whole thing, and then I will express my assent or dissent.

Mr. QUAY. I desire the question put to the Senate on each of the propositions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the Senator's last request?

Mr. QUAY. That the vote be taken on Thursday, the 29th of January.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the final vote on the pending bill, on the then pending amendments, and the amendments then offered shall take place on the 29th of January.

Mr. QUAY. At 2 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At 2 o'clock p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I object; and on that objection I wish to say a word.

Mr. QUAY. I hope the Senator will wait until I get through with the series of propositions I wish to present.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But what is the use?

Mr. QUAY. There will be probably something else—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let the Senator—

Mr. QUAY. I decline to yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator wants to finish the schedule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania declines to yield.

Mr. QUAY. I then ask that the final vote be taken on Wednesday, February 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the final vote on the pending bill, on the then pending amendments, and amendments then offered shall be taken on Wednesday, February 4, at 2 o'clock p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I deeply regret, Mr. President, that I can not possibly agree to this, for the reason that the debate is just now in progress and it is quite beyond my power, or the power of any Senator, to say when we can reach a time when all Senators shall have spoken who desire to speak upon this measure. Of course I should be happy to accommodate the Senator if I could, but that is the situation at the present time.

Mr. QUAY. Then I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the vote be taken on Tuesday, February 10, at 2 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the vote on the pending bill, the amendments then pending, and the amendments then offered be taken on February 10 at 2 o'clock p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I make the same suggestion in reference to that; and I state right now that it is impossible for me, as chairman of the Committee on Territories, to agree to fix a date at this time for the future. That impossibility is just as apparent to the Senator from Pennsylvania as it is to anybody else. The Senator can go on and read his schedule clear down to the last, but no such proposition was ever made that I have ever heard of before in this body, and I can not now foretell on just what date the vote can be taken, and it is impossible for me now to agree upon a date.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to yield to me that I may ask a question of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. QUAY. I would prefer that the Senator from North Dakota should wait.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is a question pertaining to this same matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania declines to yield.

Mr. QUAY. I will yield the floor in a moment.

I believe the last item in the schedule was February 10, was it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was the last.

Mr. QUAY. That was objected to. Now I propose that the vote be taken on Monday, February 16; that is, within ten days

or two weeks of final adjournment. If the vote is not taken then the bill must fail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the final vote on the pending bill, on the then pending amendments, and on the amendments then offered shall be taken on Monday, February 16.

Mr. QUAY. At 2 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At 2 o'clock p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, as I stated before, it is perfectly impossible for me at this time to agree to a specific date, as the Senator from Pennsylvania no doubt knows, and in my position he would do the same as I am doing.

We have many other matters before us now, and there are many other Senators who have expressed to me a desire to speak on the pending bill. I can not say when they will get through, and so it is impossible for me at this time to fix a date or to agree upon any time for voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. QUAY. I then feel it my duty—

Mr. BATE. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania allow me to say a word?

Mr. QUAY. Certainly.

Mr. BATE. I desire to say, as one of the minority of the Committee on Territories—and I think I voice the wishes of the minority of that committee, as well as I do of my party on this side of the Chamber—that they will agree now to any one of the propositions to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has made as to the final vote on this bill. I am authorized to say that.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to give notice that to-morrow, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall move to take up the pending statehood bill, and I may ask the Senate to continue in session until it is disposed of or until an agreement is arrived at fixing some day for a vote.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will accept service of the notice, but I do not think the Senator will gain anything by that.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. President, by the courtesy of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM], I want to say a few words upon this question, not that I have any desire to enter into the merits of the case before the Senate, but because an element has been brought into this discussion of rather a political nature, and we have drifted into a somewhat political discussion. I did not expect that an issue of that character would be brought into the Senate on a question which I consider so important that it should be discussed entirely upon its merits. I refer to the question about the platform of the Republican national convention in 1896. I shall not go back beyond that convention, with whose proceedings I was familiar.

The text of that plank in the platform has been repeatedly read; so it is unnecessary for me to read it again. I will only say that I happen to know that, so far as any discussion went upon that occasion affecting Territorial affairs, growing out of the importunities of those who were interested in the question—I will not say from selfish motives, but from a desire, from their standpoint, to advance the interests of their communities that it appealed only to those in the councils of the party; that it was a question nonpolitical, that if adopted as a resolution, even although it might invite party discussion and party differences, any such expression from any party should be safeguarded with due respect to the interests of the whole country; and that was what the platform of 1896 sought to do, and did so so far as the responsibility of the Republican party was concerned.

I believe that in the following campaign the platform of 1900 had scarcely a thought, to say nothing about serious consideration, upon that question, outside of those who seemed to have been interested in the subject. Certainly, whatever may be the language of that resolution, there is nothing contained in it that breaks down the barrier of the safeguards of the resolution of 1896, reaffirming that declaration without regard to anyone's material interest, but expressing simply a public policy.

I do not understand, Mr. President, that there is enough politics in this situation to invite partisan discussion. I do not think from the standpoint of American citizenship that there is a member of this body but who is willing to undertake to defend the proposition that these infant Territories, ambitious to become States, anxious to enjoy all the privileges of statehood and the good that comes from it, should be permitted to do so when their condition justifies it. There should be no division of sentiment or opinion upon that proposition; but they should be admitted only with due regard to the interests of the United States and of the States upon whom rests the responsibility of ascertaining the facts as to whether these Territories are in a condition which makes them fit to become States.

It is not the most important matter in this question as to how many people there are in either of these Territories. To be sure, that is a factor, and it is of necessity to be taken into consideration;

but to my mind there are other and more important factors that go to make up fitness for statehood, to entitle a people to be represented and to take part in the councils of the nation, no matter how fit may be the representatives sent here. But the great principle of cooperative legislation, the good of the whole country, depends upon the responsibilities of the representation that is behind the delegate. Therefore, I say, I will not undertake to go into a discussion of the merits of this question.

I was perfectly willing to wait and hear the discussion from members of the committee who, in the ordinary routine of business affairs in the Senate, take upon themselves the responsibility of that sort of work, and, owing to that which went before in these discussions, went so far as to go personally into these Territories, to study the conditions and all the things which should go to make up the qualifications for statehood. When special committees, who, feeling the responsibility not only as to their colleagues in the Senate, but as to the country everywhere, conscientiously and thoroughly do their work of investigation and bring here a report from witnesses under oath and otherwise, and when as a result of that knowledge, obtained from that effort, they rise in their seats and give to the Senate and to the country the result by forcible and convincing argument, such as the speeches of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], that is the sort of information the country wants, and if this discussion should be protracted for weeks to come, the responsibility attached to our duty and oath of office does not make it less binding upon us that we hear it.

I disclaim, Mr. President, that the Republican party, either in 1896 or 1900, and, so far as my information goes, in both of the Congressional campaigns intervening, regarded this question as an issue. It was never made an issue even to the slightest degree from a national standpoint. I was somewhat familiar with those two national campaigns, and certainly in 1900 this subject was not mentioned upon the rostrum within the limits of any Territory from which I heard. Whether it was or not, whether the people of this country wanted to hear about the Territories or not, it seemed to be necessary that they might obtain the information wanted which should be satisfying as to the future, because the responsibility of never being able to undo such legislation as is now proposed made it necessary that the people should be satisfied as to the future. In all that campaign, whether because other issues overshadowed this question or not, it was a fact that it was not made a political question.

In that connection, as to the feeling and sentiment which dominates this country to-day, I want to say that the discussions upon this floor have not only been necessary and effective, but they have filled a demand which is increasing every day the discussion goes on, and so far as I am able to understand and diagnose the sentiment of this country the feeling of confidence is growing stronger every day in the judgment and intelligence of the members of this body who are acting from a conservative standpoint. Feeling and appreciating the importance of this question, they do not propose to hurry it or to be hurried in its conclusion.

It makes no difference to the Democratic party or to the Republican party as to the sentiments of a political character which may be injected into this discussion. If I were in a position to argue upon the merits of this question, I would feel justified in appealing to every member upon the other side of this Chamber upon that question of merit alone. The dignity of this country and its future greatness and prosperity are just as dear to the hearts of one class as to another. There can be no political issue injected into a question which so nearly affects the principles upon which we are supposed to build our future.

The Republican party in that resolution at St. Louis voiced a sentiment which was brought there by the elements that are behind this measure. They heard and gave consideration to the men coming from the Territories, members of that party, and who, whatever their motive, were entitled to consideration; but in giving consideration to those who are knocking at the door of the Union we have said that we must safeguard that so that this matter can go before the proper tribunal; and when the question comes to be considered, it must be decided upon its merits. This matter was not intended, by being placed as a plank in the platform, to be made a party issue, and it can not or ought not to be such to-day.

I am absolutely opposed to the omnibus bill, Mr. President, because it seems to me to be in the nature of a compact between those who are behind this measure to avail themselves of the opportunity of uniting in its support influence and power. There must be a weak spot somewhere; there must be some feature of this bill that needs the support of a stronger element to win for it votes enough to make States out of these three Territories. In order that this body and the people of this country may have the opportunity to judge for themselves, we want this discussion to

proceed along the lines it has, coming, as it does, from the men whom this body delegated to gather that information, who realize the responsibilities of that task and the obligations of their oaths to obtain that information. We want this discussion to go on until the whole question is laid bare, not only before the United States Senate, but before the country, and, so far as my opportunities enable me to judge of the results, I feel perfectly safe in saying that, in my judgment, public opinion, the highest and best arbiter of all public questions, is to-day forming a sentiment which justifies the report of the committee and justifies the statements that have been made by every member of that committee who has spoken upon the subject.

I do not want to see this legislation hurried at an unseemly rate, or to occupy a position in this body where it shall in any way retard the business of importance which is coming before us. I do not believe there is any disposition to delay among those who, from a full realization of their responsibility and duty, want to have this debate go on so long as it develops new information, so long as it brings to the surface new thoughts and facts which will enable us to vote rightly upon the question. I do not believe it is the intention, and I will not believe it is the feeling in this body on the part of anybody on either side of the Chamber to filibuster, as I understand the term, or unnecessarily to delay action when the time arrives at which a man, fully advised, can vote as his conscience dictates.

Therefore, Mr. President, as the debate goes on, I hope the sentiment which seems to have been manifest to-day with reference to the arbitrary position of one side or the other, or the drastic measures which may be imposed by one side or the other, will not again appear in any shape or form or result in an effort that will in the slightest degree interfere with the important business which we have before us, no matter what may be the individual ambition of any man or set of men living in those Territories or desiring to represent them in the halls of Congress. While that ambition and desire may be perfectly laudable and can not be charged as entirely selfish, still it sinks into insignificance on an occasion like this. Therefore what I have to say is not so much in the line of argument as of an appeal to the Senators of this body to let this important discussion proceed, developing any new matter and facts and arguments that may change the opinion of any man who has the right to vote, and then let the majority decide, not influenced by passion or prejudice or selfish motives, but acting on our calm and deliberate judgment, formed as the result of those arguments and facts which should influence the minds of men in our position.

Mr. BURTON. May I interrupt the Senator from Ohio for a moment?

Mr. HANNA. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. In order that there may be full opportunity for discussion, do you not think it would be wise to agree upon a day, far in the future, at which the vote should be taken? Then it will not interfere with any other business, if there is to be a vote.

Mr. HANNA. I do not propose to take any responsibility out of the hands of the gentlemen who have charge of this measure. I do not think they need any defense as to the attitude they have taken and the course they are pursuing in this matter. The fact that an insinuation may have been thrown out as to their motives with respect to dilatory tactics does not justify the inquiry, neither does it justify the method pursued by the other side to call upon a Senator to answer a question which ought not to be answered under present conditions and until the members of the committee are satisfied as to the discussion itself.

Mr. BURTON. If the Senator will allow me, I did not ask the question in order to cast reflection upon anybody.

Mr. HANNA. No; I did not so understand it.

Mr. BURTON. I simply asked the opinion of the Senator as to whether that is not the easiest way to get a determination of this question.

Mr. HANNA. Yes, the easiest way, I may say in reply to the Senator, to accommodate an opposition is to surrender. That is the easiest way.

Mr. BURTON. Then I understand the Senator is not in favor of ever coming to a vote.

Mr. HANNA. No; you do not understand anything of the kind, because I do not propose to have you understand it in that way. But whether I be on the affirmative or the negative side of this proposition, in view of the importance of this measure and of the policy involved, I would consider it unfair to agree upon a time to vote before the members of the committee who have charge of the measure, who have investigated the subject, who came here to make reports for the information of the Senate and the country, have exercised the right and privilege of giving, in their own way and at their own time, those facts to the Senate and to the country.



I am not seeking to excite anyone. I would rather produce a feeling which would lead to the condition suggested by the Senator from Kansas. I claim that this subject is of enough importance to demand deliberation and calm judgment. In my short service in this body I have seen time wasted day after day and week after week upon measures far less important. So I do not have any qualms of conscience in urging that this discussion shall go on legitimately and fairly, because I believe, so far as the evidence has been given and so far as statements have been made, which are uncontroverted, that public opinion in this country, which is crystallizing around the subject, and which must be made manifest sooner or later, will convince the majority of this body that there is danger in hasty action; that there is danger of doing an act which can not be undone, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] has so ably said, no matter how much the regret and no matter how much harm may result to the country.

I have heard it argued that the Republican party should be held up to its responsibility for having committed an unwise act in the Spanish war. Two wrongs never made a right. If, as charged by the advocates of that proposition at the time, we were wrong, and it shall be found from experience that we acted hastily, it is no reason why those who are not implicated in past actions with reference to the admission of other Territories and who are not responsible either to their party or their country for that act, should not investigate to the utmost every fact and condition which can properly and legitimately be brought to bear in forming their judgment upon this question.

I simply rose, Mr. President, to protest against the assumption that this question should be considered absolutely from a political standpoint or that, because there may have been a difference in the wording of the platforms of 1896 and 1900, any representative in this body connected with the Republican party should be charged with and held accountable for the wording of the platform, before there had been any public discussion, before it had ever been made an issue which called for public discussion for the enlightenment and intelligence of the people. I am not willing that the Republican party shall rest under such a charge, nor am I prepared to charge the party on the other side of the Chamber with any other intent than to protect the interests of the United States and of the States, for when you consider a proposition to confer equal power upon a Territory yet in its infancy, no matter by what standard you measure its virtues and its material interests, it involves a community of interest as to which in the last analysis we must determine what is right, and do it.

Mr. BURNHAM obtained the floor.

Mr. CULLOM. It is getting late, and the Senator from New Hampshire would hardly be able to proceed very far with his speech this evening. I suggest to him that he take the floor and yield to me; and if he does so, I will move an executive session.

Mr. BURNHAM. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 21, 1903, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 20, 1903.*

##### COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

William A. Richards, of Wyoming, now Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, to be Commissioner of the General Land Office, to take effect February 2, 1903, vice Binger Hermann, resigned.

##### ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

John H. Fimple, of Carrollton, Ohio, to be Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, vice William A. Richards, nominated to be Commissioner.

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

James Low, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Niagara, in the State of New York. (Reappointment.)

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Charles W. Rae, to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of January, 1903, vice Capt. Franklin Hanford, retired.

Lieut. Commander John K. Barton, to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of January, 1902, vice Commander Harrie Webster, promoted.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

###### Cavalry Arm.

Lieut. Col. Samuel M. Swigert, Ninth Cavalry, to be colonel, January 16, 1903, vice Hennisee, Fifth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Maj. Edward A. Godwin, Tenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel, January 16, 1903, vice Swigert, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Robert D. Read, jr., Tenth Cavalry, to be major, January 16, 1903, vice Godwin, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles T. Boyd, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain, January 16, 1903, vice Read, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

###### Artillery Corps.

First Lieut. Peter C. Hains, jr., Artillery Corps, to be captain, December 30, 1902, vice McManus, detailed as quartermaster.

Second Lieut. Tilman Campbell, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant, December 30, 1902, vice Hains, promoted.

##### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1903.*

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Morgan H. Beach, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

Timothy F. Burke, of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming.

##### REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Archibald W. Munger, of Eau Claire, Wis., to be register of the land office at Eau Claire, Wis.

##### MARSHALS.

J. Duncan Adams, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the district of South Carolina.

Frank A. Hadsell, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming.

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### GEORGIA.

Nemie F. Awtrey, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Troup and State of Georgia.

###### KANSAS.

Caddie Smith, to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the county of Smith and State of Kansas.

Sydney W. Gould, to be postmaster at Weir, in the county of Cherokee and State of Kansas.

###### OREGON.

John M. Parry, to be postmaster at Moro, in the county of Sherman and State of Oregon.

###### TEXAS.

Wilber H. Webber, to be postmaster at Lampasas, in the county of Lampasas and State of Texas.

William T. Black, to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, in the county of Titus and State of Texas.

Harry H. Cooper, to be postmaster at Nacogdoches, in the county of Nacogdoches and State of Texas.

Theodore Miller, to be postmaster at Rusk, in the county of Cherokee and State of Texas.

George S. Ziegler, to be postmaster at Eagle Lake, in the county of Colorado and State of Texas.

Bayles E. Cobb, to be postmaster at Canyon, in the county of Randall and State of Texas.

William Drawe, to be postmaster at Cuero, in the county of Dewitt and State of Texas.

James M. Kindred, to be postmaster at Amarillo, in the county of Potter and State of Texas.

Henry T. Canfield, to be postmaster at Wichita Falls, in the county of Wichita and State of Texas.

C. E. Littlefield, to be postmaster at Luling, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas.

William D. McCaslin, to be postmaster at Detroit, in the county of Red River and State of Texas.

Ella O. Vawter, to be postmaster at Timpson, in the county of Shelby and State of Texas.

Isham H. Nelson, to be postmaster at Snyder, in the county of Scurry and State of Texas.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 20, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported the bill (H. R. 16910) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order on the bill.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16842) making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. GROSVENOR in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill of the House 16842. By unanimous consent, general debate is to begin at this time and continue for two hours.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, by unanimous consent, as the Chair has stated, we deferred general debate until this morning, owing to the fact that the gentlemen who were to take part in the general debate, understanding that the bill would not come up until this morning, were absent from the room. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] advises me that they will require about an hour and a quarter on that side, and I desire to reserve the remaining part of the two hours for myself.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, with hesitation that may be pardoned and with embarrassment that may be condoned, I rise for the first time to address this historic body. I would not dare to break the silence in which a new member is supposed to be entombed were I not prompted by a sense of duty to my constituents which my diffidence can not conquer nor my timidity repress. I can not witness the passing of another session of Congress without protest against Republican inaction on the question of the trust.

The Republican party is writing the most shameful and humiliating chapter in American history. Six years of Republican supremacy have marked the establishment of an industrial tyranny more powerful than all the thrones and empires of the past. Within this period the wealth of the country has been concentrated in the hands and coffers of the few to such an extent that the people are threatened with economic vassalage. Republican enactments and policies have facilitated the creation of monopolistic organizations in almost every important industry—monopolies which are crushing labor, corrupting legislation, destroying competition, controlling production, confiscating the fruitage of the people's toil, and stifling the ambitions of youth. [Applause.]

The latest and most dangerous form which monopoly has assumed in America is popularly known as the trust. In a sense strictly technical a trust is a combination of corporations acting through a representative board. But in the political lexicon of the hour the term "trust" includes every organization of individuals or of companies which through combination, merger, purchase, destruction of rival enterprises, or other means obtains, or attempts with varying degrees of success to obtain, exclusive control of a given industry or commodity whereby prices are arbitrarily fixed, production limited, competition abolished, natural causes interrupted, and the consumer pillaged. In some instances the organization extends no further than a mere agreement or pool by which these results are secured. This modern trust is the fortress of greed in the twentieth century. It is the most powerful agency for the concentration of wealth in the economic annals of the world. It is the most menacing feature of the time. It represents the barbarism of wealth, the anarchy of avarice. [Applause.]

Since the beginning of Republican ascendancy in 1897 the trusts have grown enormously in numbers and in power. More trusts have been formed since March 4, 1897, the date of McKinley's ac-

cession to the Presidency, than in all the previous history of the country. There are more than 300 industrial trusts in the United States with a total capitalization of over seven billions—an amount which stupefies the imagination, an amount which exceeds the entire stock of money in the United States both in circulation and out of circulation by more than four and one-half billions. They control almost every article and commodity which the people use in the maintenance of civilized life. [Applause.]

Before the first inauguration of McKinley an organization with a capital of ten millions was regarded as unusual. But since January 1, 1899, 82 trusts have been established, not one of which has less than ten millions of capital, many of which possess from three to ten and twenty times ten millions, while towering like a helmeted Colossus above them all is the monarch of combinations, the steel trust, with a startling capitalization of over one billion three hundred and fifty millions. The trusts exist in utter defiance of all justice and all law. Secure in the knowledge of the fact that the Republican party will not enforce the laws which sleep ingloriously on the statutes, and that this party of monopoly and empire dares not enact more stringent legislation, they continue with an insolence which cries to God for punishment to oppress the land and to consume the substance of the people.

In no way have the Republicans, including the President himself, attempted more shrewdly to shield the capitalistic freebooters and to confuse the people than in the endeavor to establish the impression that the present clamor against the trusts is a hasty and ill-considered attack on corporations because they are unprecedentedly large; that "the big corporations," to use an elusive expression of our once strenuous Chief Executive, are alleged to be the main offenders regardless of monopolistic attributes. We say that it matters not how large or how small an enterprise may be. If it has the character of monopoly in any effective degree it is a trust. It is the principle involved which concerns the Democratic party as the stay and refuge of the people and not the size or extent of the organization.

The Democratic party is not opposed to honest wealth. It condemns neither individuals nor companies whose business affairs may be conducted on a large, or even a gigantic scale, on account of the mere size of their holdings and transactions. Individuals and companies may engage in extensive enterprises with tremendous capital and achieve marked success without the aid or design of monopoly and without special privilege from the Government. The Democratic party stands upon the demand that the entire business of the country shall be conducted in a pure and legitimate way. It is against the injustice and piracy in modern establishments that it would direct the popular wrath. It is monopoly, an evil which threatens the extinction of American liberty, that it would fling from the Tarpeian Rock of public indignation. Let me quote the words of Mr. Russell Sage concerning the steel trust, the most notable type of the modern industrial combination.

In an article in the North American Review which appeared when the steel trust was in process of formation and when its capital was reputed to be \$1,000,000,000, Mr. Sage said:

The steel combination now forming, we are told, is to start off with a capital of \$1,000,000,000. It will be seen, therefore, that this company's issue of securities will represent practically one-half the entire volume of money in America. In a year or two, if precedents count for anything, this capital will be very largely increased, and that in spite of the fact that the stockholders in the steel company, which was the basis of the new combination, got three shares of stock in the new company for one in the old, scores of millions being thus added to the interest-bearing securities of the United States by merely the stroke of a pen. When wealth is created in that way what security is there for the whole scheme? Not another furnace added to the plant, simply a lifting process, and what was one million before is three millions now.

When we know that Mr. Sage underestimated the capital of the steel trust by more than three hundred and fifty millions; when we know that the properties of this company in actual value do not exceed five hundred millions, but little more than one-third of its capitalization, we may begin to grasp the appalling fraud which permeates the entire system. We may reasonably infer from this instance that practically one-half the seven billions of capital represented by the dividend-bearing securities of the industrial trusts is purely fictitious. It is certain, at any rate, that the amount of imaginary capital on which the American people must pay exorbitant interest in the shape of arbitrary prices is so enormous as to constitute the most flagrant example of public plunder by private monopoly in human history. [Applause.]

It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise that the owners and beneficiaries of the trusts are rapidly absorbing the entire wealth of the people; that an aristocracy has arisen which dominates the industrial and social world. This aristocracy may be perpetuated by the transmission of trust stock from father to son. The power which the trusts have centered in the gilded few is astounding. Mr. Sage, in speaking of the oil trust, said:

The chief owners of the Standard Oil business have become so enormously wealthy that in their individual as well as their corporate capacity they dominate wherever they choose to go. They can make or unmake almost any



property, no matter how vast. They can compel any man to sell them anything at any price.

These are the words of a man whose authority on this and kindred subjects is universally respected. It is difficult to conceive a more alarming condition. The income of Mr. John Davis Rockefeller, the principal owner of the oil trust, was in 1901 about \$100,000,000. He is soon to become the first billionaire in the history of the world. This inconceivable wealth has been acquired within fewer than thirty years. The story of his triumphs over all competitors, of their submission or their ruin, of his successful evasion and defiance of all law, until he had established the most invincible monopoly earth ever saw, will, if ever written, form a gloomy commentary upon the age.

There were 9,000 civil suits pending against this economic despot at one time—a suit in almost every county of every State in the American Union. But the people and the people's laws were helpless, and to-day he towers above Congress, above the President, above the legislatures and the courts, above the people, a silent symbol of industrial tyranny. [Applause.] Associated with him is Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan. These two men are the most commanding figures of contemporary history. Mr. Morgan controls over three billions of railroad securities and nearly two billions of corporation securities. An illustration of his power may be found in the recent coal strike. It was within his will to stop that terrible conflict at any time; a conflict which resulted in suffering so universal and intense that the poor have been compelled to burn the pictures of their dead for fuel, and in some instances to steal. A petition was addressed to President Roosevelt from the citizens of Wilkesbarre, the storm center of the strike, which concluded as follows:

Mr. Morgan has placed a ban upon us which means universal ruin, destitution, and bloodshed. Is J. P. Morgan greater than the people? Is he mightier than the Government? Will he be permitted to retain this menacing power? We appeal to you, Mr. President, to stay the juggernaut which crushes us. We appeal from the king of the trusts to the President of the people.

This appeal is the saddest and most significant occurrence since Republican rule began. It shows the overshadowing power of organized wealth. Connected with Rockefeller and Morgan are an increasing number of multi-millionaires, and together they constitute an omnipotent oligarchy of gold. They are the Vandals, Goths, and Visigoths of our modern time. They are the economic tyrants of the United States and their increasing strength is a menace to every principle and every institution of popular government. [Applause.]

Republicans, have I overdrawn the picture? Let me direct your attention to a speech delivered by Mr. Theodore Roosevelt at Minneapolis on Labor Day of 1901, shortly before he became the official head of the nation. In reference to the trusts he said:

We shall find it necessary in the future to shackle cunning as in the past we have shackled force. The vast individual and corporate fortunes, the vast combinations of capital which have marked the development of our industrial system, create new conditions and necessitate a change from the old attitude of the State and nation toward property.

The glory of San Juan Hill is in these sentences.

If a Democrat had made a statement half so sweeping he would have been denounced as an anarchist, an agitator, and a demagogue. Let us analyze these utterances of the most prominent Republican in the country. He says that it will become necessary in the future to shackle cunning as in the past we have shackled force. Now, the entire history of the world is the story of the long struggle of the common people to put shackles on force. Think of all the oppressions of the past! Think of the conquerors who have ravaged the world! Think of the thrones that have been built upon the necks of serfs! Think of the woes of the people in the shadowy centuries of the crown and sword! Think how they passed like chattels with the soil! Think how they cowered in the shelter of mediæval castles to do obeisance for their lives! Think how hunger and despair aroused them to revolt! Think of the blood, the sorrow, and the tears they paid for freedom—the shackling of force! Think how we are told by Mr. Roosevelt that as in the past it was necessary to shackle force, so in the future it will become necessary to shackle cunning.

Then tell me how a Democrat can overdraw the picture. But this is not all. Mr. Roosevelt evidently believed that the hour for the shackling of the trusts had struck, because he further said that the vast individual and corporate fortunes and the vast combinations of wealth had created new conditions and that they necessitated a change from the old attitude of the State and nation toward property. If human greed through the industrial trust is oppressing, or is about to oppress, the people as in the past they have been oppressed by force—if these modern aggregations have become so dangerous as to necessitate a revolution in established relations between the state and property—then the situation must be black with peril.

The echoes of this courageous declaration of Mr. Roosevelt had

hardly died, the applause of the people who believed a new David had arisen was still ringing from the mountains to the seas, when a hush fell upon the world. A pistol's lips spoke death to McKinley and pronounced Theodore Roosevelt President of the United States. Was it destiny? The preacher whom Mr. Roosevelt invited to deliver at Oyster Bay a sermon on the anniversary of McKinley's death thought that it was. The preacher practically said on that occasion that God raised up an assassin to take the life of the revered McKinley in order to give Theodore Roosevelt an opportunity to forge the Minneapolis philippic into the avenging thunderbolts of the law. So, I ask again, was it destiny?

If it was, destiny for once made a gigantic mistake. When Theodore Roosevelt assumed the Presidency, a marvelous transformation seems to have occurred. He seems to have put the people out of his heart. In the light of his record as Chief Executive with regard to trusts, his Minneapolis speech is a disheartening mockery. Has he shackled the trusts? For more than a year he has been charged by solemn oath with the execution of his country's laws, and yet the trusts have multiplied and prospered. [Applause.] He chose for Attorney-General, the nation's right arm in the enforcement of the nation's laws, Mr. Philander Knox, of the steel company, the most prominent trust attorney in the United States. Thus the Republican President has paralyzed the law.

While pretending to seek new remedies, he has neglected to enforce existing ones. His messages and speeches on the subject of the trusts have been models of apology and evasion. And yet the New York Herald calls him the people's antitrust candidate for the Presidency in 1904. It is the most colossal jest of the time. His course in this matter is typically Republican, for the Republican party is equally chargeable with failure to restrain the trusts. Bills have been introduced, but never passed. A favorite trick is to pass an antitrust bill through the House, and send it to a quick death in the catacombs of the Senate.

It is a laughable fact that not one of the measures proposed by Republicans is as vigorous as the remedies already provided by the national statutes. The criminal clause of the present Federal law has been absolutely ignored. Its enforcement would do much to shackle cunning. But it is a neglected law, and it will so remain as long as the Republican party controls the Government. If a poor man takes that which is not his he is pronounced a thief and promptly punished. But if a great industrial combination monopolizes an article and robs the people in plain defiance of the law, the directors are applauded and called the kings and captains of our industries. In his message at the beginning of the present session of Congress the President speaks of the "big aggregations" as "inevitable developments of modern industrialism," and adds that their destruction "would work the utmost mischief to the entire body politic."

In a recent speech in the United States Senate the senior Senator from Massachusetts spoke tenderly of the "great private virtues" of the modern plunderers, of their "public spirit, sagacity, patriotism, and large civic wisdom." For what relief can the people hope when Republicans indulge in utterances of this character? In another part of his speech the senior Senator from Massachusetts summarizes the efforts of the Republican Administration to control the trusts. Coming from so high and so Republican a source, this summary may be taken as a complete presentation of the record of the Administration on this subject. The venerable and eloquent Senator states that the Administration has destroyed the Addyston pipe combination, the beef trust, and a pooling arrangement among Southern railroads.

He states that the Attorney-General has brought fourteen suits in equity against another railroad combination, obtaining injunctions which are still in force, and that he has also brought a suit in equity against a proposed merger of transcontinental railroads. This is the Republican record as presented by a Republican. When we think of the hundreds of monopolies that have arisen under Republican domination, when we know that these vultures are fattening to-day as never before, these efforts appear so feeble as to excite the profoundest ridicule and contempt.

In the attempt to divert the attention of the people of the North from the record of the Republican party on the question of the trust, the President and his advisers have reopened and aggravated the unhappy race issue in the South. It means that Republicans regard the situation as desperate when for political advantage they deem it advisable deliberately to humiliate the proud and loyal people of the South and to awaken passions born in the flaming hours of fratricidal conflict, passions which should be permitted to die in an era of reconciliation and peace. The people of the North are too intelligent and too generous to be influenced by such deplorable tactics. On the essential phases of the race problem the great common people of the North are in sympathy with the people of the South.

One touch of nature makes the whole world kin.

Sectional divisions in America are no more. Every problem

which confronts any portion of the people or any part of the country is an American problem. We are brothers of a common country. Not as a Texan, although I worship that imperial State; not as a Southerner, although I adore that chivalrous land; but as an American who loves every star on the flag I pronounce such action unnecessary and unjust. [Applause.]

It is useless to hope that the Republican party will destroy or curb the trusts. For six years it has controlled every branch of the American Government. It has failed to resist the incursions of marauding capital. It has made the American Republic a spectacle for the pity of the historian and the compassion of the philosopher. In the endeavor to conceal its real attitude with regard to trusts it presents the supremest illustration of human insincerity since Metternich preserved a throne with intrigue and Talleyrand taught that lips were made to lie. It has polluted the temples and desecrated the altars of authority. The trusts are flourishing in contempt of law. They prosecute their merciless schemes of spoliation undisturbed. There is but one conclusion—the Republican party is the shield and ally of the trust. If the trust is to be abolished, if industrial Caesarism is to be destroyed, the Republican party must be whipped from power by the scorn and anger of a plundered people. [Applause.] A vote for the Republican party is a vote for economic slavery, a vote for stupendous wrong, a vote for criminal capital, a vote for the inhumanity and communism of lawless wealth. [Loud and prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the time of Mr. SHEPPARD expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague have time to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the time on that side can be yielded by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. By unanimous consent it can be granted.

Mr. BENTON. I would be very glad to yield the gentleman further time, but the time at my disposal has already been apportioned.

The CHAIRMAN. It changes the hour of closing general debate.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I then ask unanimous consent that the hour at which debate is to be closed be changed to a different time, fifteen minutes later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time for closing general debate be extended until fifteen minutes after 2, the time to be awarded to the gentleman from Texas. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank my colleague for his kindness.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he desires to use any of his time now?

Mr. McCLEARY. I would prefer that the gentleman from Missouri use up his time first.

Mr. BENTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I do not see the gentleman from Missouri at present, but I understood him that he yielded the balance of his time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] who has just closed. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OTJEN].

Mr. OTJEN. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday last this House passed a bill for the purpose of creating a department of commerce, and by a vote of this House the Interstate Commerce Commission was placed under this department. Recently there was held in St. Louis a convention in which there were represented over 100 commercial organizations, and an executive committee was appointed by this convention for the purpose of securing legislation increasing the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This executive committee believes that the placing of the Interstate Commerce Commission under any department would be unwise, and I ask to have read the telegram which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., January 19, 1903.

Hon. THEO. OTJEN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I am instructed by the executive committee of interstate commerce law convention, representing over 100 commercial organizations in movement to secure legislation strengthening Interstate Commerce Commission, to petition Congress against converting that Commission into bureau of any department.

E. P. BACON.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. OTJEN. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. This paper or telegram is signed by whom?

Mr. OTJEN. The chairman of the executive committee appointed at a convention held at St. Louis.

Mr. HEPBURN. When did the convention assemble?

Mr. OTJEN. Some time during the year past.

Mr. HEPBURN. How large is the executive committee?

Mr. OTJEN. I think there are five members.

Mr. HEPBURN. How many of them reside in Milwaukee?

Mr. OTJEN. I do not know, but I do not think all of them.

Mr. HEPBURN. Do any of them reside there, except one?

Mr. OTJEN. I think, probably, he is the only one that resides there.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is it not true that this legislation that is protested against was had here on the 17th day of the month?

Mr. OTJEN. Last Saturday; yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. And Sunday intervened between that day and the date of this telegram. Is it probable that there has been any meeting of that committee since Saturday?

Mr. OTJEN. It may be that there may have been telegraphic communication between them.

Mr. HEPBURN. I ask the gentleman for this purpose: I received a telegram from some gentleman who places himself at the head of the Hay Dealers' Association, I think it is, of the United States, and he speaks in the name of his association. I have no objection to any gentleman speaking for himself, but multiplying himself in this way is perhaps a work of supererogation.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad if the gentleman from Minnesota would yield five minutes to me.

Mr. McCLEARY. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have sought these five minutes for the purpose of replying to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. He has characterized what he claims to be an unauthorized surrender of a very meager strip of territory away up to the northward by the present Administration as one of the crimes of the century. That, perhaps, is not his language, but he has intended to characterize that action as a crime of the greatest enormity. He says there is a surrender. I say not. He says there is a surrender of that undisputed territory. I say the territory is in dispute.

But I want to call his attention to another act of an Administration in the United States in connection with our Northwestern Territory that he has said nothing about. And yet it was the surrender of a vast scope of territory about which, perhaps, the Democratic party could not claim there was a dispute, that was equal to and is equal to very many of the larger States of the Federal Union. It was a surrender of all that territory lying between the forty-ninth parallel and 54° 40', and between the Lake of the Woods and the Pacific Ocean, a territory sufficient in subdivision to make 12 of the largest States of the Federal Union.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman says I made no reference to that.

Mr. HEPBURN. As a crime.

Mr. COCHRAN. I said that no American citizen had ever justified it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered by all readers of history of this country that the Democratic party made a campaign in 1844, using this as their shibboleth, "fifty-four forty or fight;" that is, we would have all of the Northwestern Territory that we claimed up to 54° 40' or we would fight the power of Great Britain. No dispute then about our ownership! Let us see what the Democratic party said:

*Resolved*, That our title to the whole of the territory of Oregon is clear and unquestionable; that no portion of the claim ought to be ceded to England or any power, but that the reoccupation of Oregon and the reannexation of Texas at the earliest practicable period are great American measures which this convention recommends to the cordial support of the Democracy of the United States.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is good doctrine yet.

Mr. HEPBURN. I read from the first message of President Polk:

Though entertaining the settled conviction that the British pretensions of title could not be maintained to any portion of the Oregon territory upon any principle of public law recognized by nations, yet in deference—

and so on. He was content that another course should be pursued. But here is the explicit declaration that the pretensions of title on the part of Great Britain could not be maintained to any portion of the Oregon territory. And again he says:

With this conviction, the proposition of compromise which had been made and rejected was by my direction subsequently withdrawn, and our title to the whole of the Oregon territory asserted, and, as is believed, maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa one question.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY. I yield the gentleman ten minutes more.

Mr. HEPBURN. I shall not want that much time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Iowa whether at the time the contention of the United States for 54° 40' was surrendered, Daniel Webster was not Secretary of State?

Mr. HEPBURN. Do not make a speech; I understood the gentleman wanted to ask a question.

Mr. COCHRAN. It was the action of a Whig Administration which had succeeded on the death of the President.

Mr. HEPBURN. Ah, yes! "A Whig administration," was it? Who were the envoys that negotiated the treaty of surrender? James Buchanan was one. Was he a Whig?

Mr. COCHRAN. Who was Secretary of State at the time?

Mr. HEPBURN. Who approved of that treaty? James K. Polk. Who ratified it? A Democratic Senate, surrendering 12 States of this country.

Mr. COCHRAN. Who was Secretary of State?

Mr. HEPBURN. But that is not all. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman to the language of this resolution of the Democratic party that I have read, which demanded the "reannexation" of Texas. The gentleman knows what this language means.

Mr. COCHRAN. Who was the Secretary of State?

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman knows that we owned Texas, that it was a part of the Louisiana purchase, but that James Monroe, a Democrat, in 1819, when he purchased the Floridas for \$19,000,000, surrendered Texas—gave it back to Spain. And so the gentleman will find that the legislation for the recognition of Texas as one of the States of the Union was entitled "A bill for the reannexation of Texas." It had been annexed; it had been surrendered; it was now reannexed. Who surrendered it? A Democratic Administration. They surrendered it as they surrendered Oregon; they surrendered what would make four or five average States in Texas, and what would have made twelve great States in the Northwestern Territory. And now the gentleman comes forward and says that this possible surrender of a narrow strip of this territory away up near the sixtieth parallel of latitude is one of the crimes of the century, unparalleled, and calls for the condemnation of the whole Republican party.

Mr. COCHRAN. I call attention to the fact that the gentleman has taken his seat without answering my question, although he had ten minutes additional time in which to do it.

Mr. HEPBURN. What was the question?

Mr. COCHRAN. Whether Daniel Webster was not Secretary of State during the negotiations that culminated in settling the boundary dispute in the Northwest.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Polk was President of the United States. He appointed James Buchanan, then his Secretary of State, our negotiator, who did negotiate the treaty. Mr. Polk approved it; Mr. Polk sent it to a Democratic Senate, and a Democratic Senate ratified it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCHRAN. I will take occasion to call this matter up a little later and to correct some of the gentleman's statements of historical fact.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the time for general debate allotted to the other side having expired, and there being no further request for time on this side, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be now considered closed and that we proceed with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the time for general debate will be considered as closed.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For furniture for new school buildings and additions to buildings, as follows: For 4 eight-room buildings, at \$1,750 each; addition to Cranch Building, \$875; and 5 four-room buildings, at \$875 each; in all, \$12,350.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want the floor for a few moments. I was very much interested, Mr. Chairman, in listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] a little while ago regarding the Alaskan boundary. The gentleman from Missouri substantially charged that the Administration was surrendering, or intended to surrender, American territory in Alaska to the Canadian government. He submitted facts to prove this that seem to me to be conclusive; but it needed no proof from him and no eloquent words to demonstrate that to me.

I have been to Alaska several times. I have been over this boundary line. I have talked to people there who know, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that since gold was discovered in the Klondyke the Northwest mounted police, acting, we must assume, for the Canadian government, have moved the boundary monuments that the Russians set up years ago,

marking the boundary line of the territory that Russia ceded to the United States under the treaty, miles and miles nearer the Pacific Ocean and more and more on American territory. If anyone here doubts it, let me say that there are several people in Washington at this time from Alaska who can give unimpeachable testimony to the fact.

There is no doubt the original boundary line between Canada and southeastern Alaska has been changed by the Canadians during the past few years. What does the gentleman from Iowa say in regard to the allegations made by the gentleman from Missouri? He says, as I understand it, that some time ago, some way, somehow, away back in 1844, an Administration gave up 54° 40'. That was wrong; but two wrongs do not make a right. That surrender is no reason why we should surrender now. No man in this country has ever deprecated the surrender of "fifty-four forty or fight" more than myself. We should have stood by the verdict of the people then. I have traveled some in the great Northwest. I know to some degree what we lost there.

It is one of the grandest countries in all the world—rich beyond the dreams of avarice—a country that can support a population of 50,000,000 people; a country rich in agricultural resources, rich in timber and rich in untold mineral wealth. I am sorry shortsighted statesmanship lost it to us years ago. It was a crime against us and against generations yet unborn. But those in authority did not know then what we know now. One of the greatest Secretaries of State we ever had—a myriad-minded man, a patriot—Daniel Webster, made the surrender of all the territory from the forty-ninth parallel to the fifty-fourth parallel of latitude westward from the Lake of the Woods because he did not know. He knew all about Massachusetts, but very little about the great Northwest, and when I say that I mean the great Northwest of Canada; but because he then surrendered this territory to Great Britain, because he thought it more or less valueless, that is no reason why the present Secretary of State should surrender an inch of Alaskan territory to Great Britain now. We must maintain our rights in Alaska. We must not give up or let go a rod of American soil there.

Let me say that one of the schemes involved in this alleged boundary dispute is simply this: The Canadian government—and by that I mean, of course, Great Britain—has no port of entry on the Pacific Ocean to the Klondike and to the great Yukon territory. The Canadians want a port of entry on the Lynn Canal, near Skagway or near Dyea, so they can take their goods, wares, and merchandise through without duty. That is what they want. And to accomplish it they have moved the boundary line at Telegraph Creek on the Stikine River several miles westward on American territory, and they have moved the boundary line at Skagway and at Dyea several miles westward on American territory. There is no doubt about this. Witnesses living can testify to it. The Canadian maps will show it. Everybody in Alaska knows it. The boundary line must be put back where it belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my time be extended. I desire to make this matter plain to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULZER. I thank the House. Now, sir, if it had not been for patriotic American citizens at Skagway a few years ago the Northwest mounted police, acting under instructions, no doubt, from the Canadian government, would have taken Skagway and raised the British flag over our custom-house there. They moved their line within a few miles of Skagway, destroyed the Russian monuments, and raised the British flag. Then it was that our loyal American citizens in Skagway, at Dyea, and in Sitka began to arm, and notified the Northwest mounted police that if they moved one foot farther on American soil there would be war in the great Northwest, and such a war as brave American citizens would fight who know their rights and dare maintain them.

The Northwest mounted police stopped, and fortunately for them they did, and the customs flag of the Canadian government has remained there, but it must go back to the original line. The feeling at that time in Alaska was so intense regarding this matter that the Secretary of State and the ambassador of the United States to Great Britain entered into an agreement with the British foreign office, or, more particularly speaking, into what is known as the "modus vivendi." The Secretary of State agreed to that, and from that day to this, under the modus vivendi, everything is supposed to be in statu quo—supposed to be suspended—suspended like Mahomet's coffin, somewhere between heaven and earth. Where it is and what it is nobody who is somebody seems to know, but it appears to be enough to put us all to sleep. We must not sleep, however. If the Americans are not alert, if they are not vigilant, if we do not maintain our rights, I say it is only

a question of time when the Canadian government will creep on a little more and more until it will get a port of entry on the Lynn Canal.

The Canadian government is willing, and nobody knows it better than the gentlemen on the Joint High Commission between the United States and Canada, to concede to the United States practically everything in dispute regarding our fisheries, commercial matters, and all other things in dispute, provided the Government of the United States will give the Canadian government a port of entry in Alaska. They are willing to take Dyea, an abandoned town on the Lynn Canal, where all the houses stand empty to-day, mute witnesses of its desertion, as a port of entry—anything in fact so long as they can get a port on the Pacific in Alaska. When the Yukon and White Pass Railroad was built, Skagway became the western terminal and the port of entry to the Yukon, and Dyea, just across the canal, was abandoned and deserted.

The Canadian scheme of pushing through United States territory to an outlet on the Pacific Ocean may lead some day to serious results. "Fifty-four forty or fight" is not yet dead. It may be the shibboleth of another great political campaign, and no back down.

The Alaskan boundary question is brought up again and again by reports that Canadian officers have removed established monuments. There should be no Alaskan boundary question at all. The boundary line was settled absolutely in the treaties between Great Britain and Russia, and Russia and the United States; and it was not disputed for nearly seventy-five years. We bought certain territory which it was conceded that Russia owned and we paid for it; and no United States official should ever have dared to treat the matter as open to doubt or discussion.

The claim set up by Canada, through Great Britain, is a barefaced fraud; the controversy on the matter was a piece of unspeakable folly on our part; and the adoption of the *modus vivendi* was the first step in some mysterious scheme which may mean the loss of a strip of our Pacific coast line. Great Britain never had any title to the Pacific coast, but she succeeded in bullying us out of that part of it known as British Columbia. I say again we should have stood by the declaration, "Fifty-four forty or fight;" but we lacked the foresight. Seward did something, all that was possible, to retrieve that weakness when he bought the whole Pacific coast northward, and day by day our diplomatists have been preparing the way for another surrender of our plain rights. President Roosevelt, we are told, means to look into this matter himself and act.

Let us hope so. Unless all estimates of his character are astray his course will be to say politely that there is no Alaska boundary question; that it was settled by treaties long ago; and that there is nothing to do but lay down the line described in the treaties.

Thomas W. Balch, in the *Journal of the Franklin Institute* for March, has made an exhaustive historical study of the Alaskan boundary, and has shown that the recent Canadian claim is entirely manufactured and without the support of any treaty or any map, except those made recently in Canada as a basis for a claim to an outlet to the sea through United States territory, and for a demand for arbitration. On this demand Mr. Balch says:

There is no more reason for the United States to allow its right to the possession of this unbroken Alaskan territory to be referred to the decision of foreign judges than would be the case if the British Empire advanced a claim to sovereignty over the coast of Georgia, or the port of Baltimore, and proposed that this demand should be referred to the judgment of subjects of third powers.

Whether the Alaskan frontier should pass over a certain mountain top or through a given gorge is a proper subject for settlement by a mutual survey. But by no possibility has Canada any right to territory touching tide water above 54 degrees and 40 minutes. The United States should never consent to refer such a proposition to arbitration.

And I say we never shall while we have an American in the White House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those familiar with this subject are aware that the Canadians are willing to take Dyea as a port of entry on the Alaskan Pacific and, in substance, give us everything in dispute between the two countries. But the American people will never consent to it. The sooner Canada understands this the better. The only question in dispute to-day, I believe, that the Canadian Commissioners and the United States Commissioners can not agree on is this Alaskan boundary question. And on that we stand on our rights. We will not arbitrate, and will never back down.

The Lynn Canal is a great body of water—a magnificent arm of the Pacific Ocean—almost as large, and for strategical and commercial purposes, as important as Long Island Sound. If the Canadians could once get a port of entry there, they could take in all their goods and merchandise into the vast Yukon territory without let or hindrance. They could fortify it and bid us defiance at some critical time when we least expected it. They would then have a port on the Pacific Ocean in the great Northwest, a port that would bring them hundreds and hundreds of

miles nearer the Orient than they are to-day. That is what they want, that is what they are after, and that is about the whole question involved in this boundary dispute.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SULZER. Certainly. I always yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is it not entirely practicable now for a Canadian importer to take his merchandise through any port of the United States, in bond, to any port in Canada?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; to a certain extent.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then they can avoid paying duty now.

Mr. SULZER. They can and they do, and that is another thing that ought not to be permitted in Alaska. That is another thing that the Alaskans are kicking about, and if you will talk to some of the Alaskans who are here in Washington—

Mr. HEPBURN. Do they not do it in Portland, do they not do it in New York, your own city, and are the New Yorkers kicking as you say the Alaskans are?

Mr. SULZER. Let me tell you that every American citizen in the Klondike who comes out with gold dust he has worked hard to get must pay to the Canadians a duty on it and he has got to pay a tax besides. If you went up there you would soon find out these things. The Alaskans believe in fair play. They believe that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. They believe that if the Canadians get all these rights from the United States, the citizens of the United States in the Yukon territory ought to get some rights from the Canadians. I have looked into this matter carefully and knowing the facts as I do, I say here and now that I am opposed to a surrender of 1 inch of American territory in Alaska. I want to see the Secretary of State dissolve the *modus vivendi* and the Administration speedily compel Great Britain to recognize the title and the boundary in Alaska as it came to us from Russia. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. STEELE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 6719. An act to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the eastern division of the eastern district of Arkansas; and

S. 6779. An act to quiet certain land titles in the State of Mississippi.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extension of police-patrol system, including purchase of new boxes, purchase and erection of the necessary poles, cross arms, insulators, pins, braces, wire, cable, conduit connections, extra labor, and other necessary items, \$5,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the concluding statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER]. I am glad to find that there is at least one Democrat, a very eminent Democrat, one who speaks, I think, by authority, who certainly ought to be permitted to speak by authority, saying that he is opposed to pulling down the American flag from an inch of our territory. I am glad to know that the Democratic party is changing its attitude with regard to the Philippine Islands. I am glad to know that he approves now of the course of the Administration. I am glad that he gives his adhesion, late as it is, to the policy of holding on, of civilizing, of doing something for those people in the great uplift of mankind. I am glad he is on that tenable ground. But I was sorry to hear the disparaging remarks that he made about Daniel Webster.

I knew that he would not make similar disparaging remarks about Henry Clay, because everybody recognizes the great resemblance between the gentleman from New York and the distinguished savant from Kentucky. [Laughter and applause.] But I confess I do not know exactly what he means when he speaks of Daniel Webster in the belittling way that he does, when he says that Daniel Webster did not know much out of the State of Massachusetts. I do not know whether he meant to say that Daniel Webster knew nothing or but little except those things that were intimately connected with Massachusetts, or whether he meant to say that when Daniel Webster passed the boundary line of Massachusetts his great intellect at once shrunk, and that vast reservoir of information that he had been filling for so many years became of inconsiderable value.

I wish the gentleman would be a little more explicit when he has five minutes in his own time to discuss this—to discuss this subject, and tell us just how he does regard Daniel Webster, and just how his opinion as to Daniel Webster is to be affected;



whether it is territorially or personally; whether it inheres in Daniel himself or in Daniel's travels. The American people would be glad to hear the gentleman re-form this opinion that he has expressed, so that they would know exactly what he did mean. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will apologize to the committee for sitting by and consenting by silence to a plain violation of the rules of the House. This general debate has been extended into the five-minute time, and both sides have been about equally guilty, and the Chair will enforce the rule of the House until the close of the reading of this bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], regarding Daniel Webster—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman that general debate must not continue.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. PAYNE. For general debate?

Mr. HULL. Five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may continue general debate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire, briefly, to reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. In the first place, I want to say that I made no reflection on the great ability and intellectuality of Daniel Webster. No man in this country respects his great name more than I do. But what I did say, and what I meant to say, and what I want everybody to distinctly understand I did say, was this: That Daniel Webster knew nothing about the vast domain in the great Northwest. Neither did others of his day, and even later—much later. Read Benjamin F. Butler's speech against the purchase of Alaska when the bill was passing this House for its purchase for \$7,200,000. Benjamin F. Butler voted against the bill, denounced it, and said, "We were buying an iceberg," whereas the climate of southeastern Alaska is milder and more genial than the climate of Washington.

At Sitka, supposed by some to be a frozen iceberg, the records kept by the Russians and Americans down to the present day show that the thermometer never reaches zero; and farther south in the great archipelago the climate in winter is much warmer, and delightfully cool and invigorating in summer. Alaska is a great land, a vast empire, and no one can tell to-day how rich it is in mineral, timber, and agricultural wealth. We are only on the threshold of knowledge concerning it, and I reiterate that we ought to be very careful about surrendering any part of it. Now is the time to be careful. It is better to be sure than be sorry. The experience of the past should be the light to guide us now and in the future. I want to see the American people hold fast to every inch of Alaskan domain, just as it came to us from Russia.

Now, one other thing, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Iowa has said that he is glad to know I am opposed to pulling down the flag. It is kind of him to say that. I am opposed to hauling down the flag when the flag is right. I have never advocated hauling down the flag on American territory, and I never will. [Applause.] I favored taking down the flag in Cuba, because we were pledged to do it, because we said to all the world that just so soon as we established peace and a stable government in Cuba we would get out and leave Cuba to the Cubans. I was in favor of keeping our word. I was in favor of taking down the flag in the Philippines and bringing it home with honor, because I sincerely and patriotically believed to keep it there with shot and shell and force would dishonor it and all that it stands for.

I was in favor then, and am now, of treating the Filipinos just the same as we treated the Cubans, and some day history will say I was right. I still believe in the principles of the Declaration of Independence. I still love the memories of our better days, and I believe the Filipinos are just as capable of self-government as the Cubans. Be that, however, as it may, I will not discuss it further now. I have not the time. I am talking about Alaska, and I will not be diverted by the gentleman from Iowa.

There is no question, I maintain, about our title to Alaska or about the loyalty and the patriotism of the Americans there. There is no question either, in my judgment, about the boundary, the original boundary which was agreed to by England and Russia almost a century ago, and which never was disputed in any way by anybody or any country until gold was discovered in the Klondike.

I tell you, and you know it, and the history of the world proves

it, that wherever gold is found England is always on hand trying to secure all or some of the territory. In Alaska the land in dispute in the boundary question is rich in gold and other precious metals, and England is trying to get all of it she can. If we are foolish enough to let her do it, we should not unjustly blame England; we should blame ourselves. I want to call a halt now and insist once and for all on our rights in Alaska. Is that too much? Should I be blamed for that? Let my friend answer. While we supinely sleep under the narcotic influence of Mr. Choate's modus vivendi, Canada is awake and creeps on apace, and in time it will be too late. This is a live, a momentous question, and we should be up and doing, not wait, not delay.

The Secretary of State must stand by our rights in Alaska. The modus vivendi must end, and the land we got from Russia, and the boundary marks she put there must forever be our land, and the Russian monuments on the mountain ranges 10 marine leagues from the mainland must be as it used to be—the true boundary line. Alaska belongs to us; we bought it; our people are there; they want to stay there; our flag is there; it must stay there, and we must stand by the patriots, those noble, brave, and gallant men who went there from our States. That is what we should do; that is the way I feel on this subject.

If we do not do it—if we sacrifice an inch of our domain in Alaska, the Alaskans will denounce us now, and future generations will execrate our memory as we to-day criticise, to use no stronger term, the men who surrendered the great Northwest after the people had determined by an election that it must be ours, that it must be fifty-four forty or fight. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FOR METROPOLITAN POLICE.

For major and superintendent, \$4,000; captain and assistant superintendent, \$1,800; 4 captains, at \$1,500 each; chief clerk, who shall also be property clerk, \$2,000; clerk, \$1,500; clerk, \$900; 2 clerks, at \$720 each; 4 surgeons of the police and fire departments, at \$540 each; additional compensation for 14 privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, \$3,360, or so much thereof as may be necessary; 10 lieutenants, at \$1,320 each; 35 sergeants, at \$1,140 each; 350 privates, class 1, at \$900 each; 240 privates, class 2, at \$1,080 each; 40 privates, class 3, at \$720 each; 3 telephone operators, at \$600 each; 24 station keepers, at \$840 each; janitor for police headquarters, \$720; 13 laborers, at \$600 each; laborer in charge of the morgue, \$580; messenger, \$700; messenger, \$500; major and superintendent, mounted, \$240; captain, mounted, \$240; 51 lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted, at \$240 each; 64 sergeants and privates, mounted, on bicycles, at \$40 each; 24 drivers, at \$600 each; and 3 police matrons, at \$600 each; in all, \$743,100.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in line 4, page 37, "for major and superintendent, \$4,000," on the ground that it changes existing law; and also against line 20, commencing, "40 privates, class 3, at \$720 each," on the same ground.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York raises two points of order, and we will take them one at a time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to have it understood that they are pending, so that I may not surrender any rights.

Mr. McCLEARY. In relation to the first point of order, fixing the salary of the major and superintendent, the act of June 20, 1878, paragraph 2, contains the following language:

Said Commissioners are hereby authorized to fix the salaries to be paid to the officers and privates of the Metropolitan police until otherwise provided by law.

The appropriation heretofore has been \$3,300, but that does not necessarily fix the salary by law. The provision under consideration places a sum at the disposal of the Commissioners for the purpose of fixing the salary. Therefore it would seem not to be subject to a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the act of June 20, 1878, authorized the Commissioners to fix the salary of the privates and officers of the department, unless otherwise fixed by law. I understand the Commissioners have not fixed the salary, and in the hearings before the committee considering this bill one of the Commissioners said that the Commissioners did not ask for any increase of salary for the chief of police. The salary provided for the superintendent of police for some years has been thirty-three hundred dollars, carried in the appropriation act. I call attention of the Chair to the case in Hinds's Parliamentary Precedents, page 322, where the present distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] made the point of order that where salaries were not fixed by law the salary fixed in the previous appropriation act was the salary under the law, and any attempt to increase that amount was subject to a point of order.

The point raised by the gentleman at that time, in the Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, was sustained by the Chair. There is no doubt but that is the rule in the House at present. I have here the appropriation acts for four years past, showing that they carried for this officer a salary of \$3,300, and this is an increase of \$700, and subject to the objection that it changes existing law.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the burden rests upon the

gentleman from New York to show affirmatively that the salary has been fixed by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Minnesota to say that the salary heretofore fixed by the District Commissioners is \$3,300.

Mr. McCLEARY. The amount carried in the appropriation bill, Mr. Chairman, has been for several years \$3,300. There is no other legislative provision concerning it.

The CHAIRMAN. The practice of the Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has been against, I may say, the opinion quite often expressed by the present occupant of the chair, that when an appropriation bill of the preceding year fixed a salary that that was the salary provided by law and that an addition to that salary was a change of existing law.

It seems to the Chair that the citation by the gentleman from New York is pertinent. This was in 1898. The preceding appropriation bill had provided a salary of \$1,400 for the assistant professor at the Naval Academy, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON] moved to increase that to \$1,800, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] made the point of order that if there was no statute providing for the salary of this office, then the salary appropriated for from year to year in appropriation bills was to be regarded as the legal salary, and the Chair sustained the point of order. Following the precedent, the Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations realized that this might be subject to a point of order. The great excellence of the services of him for whom the additional salary was provided and the feeling that no one failed to recognize that excellence, and that therefore no one would raise the point of order, is our justification for inserting it in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes a further point of order against the provision in lines 20 and 21.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the provision in lines 20 and 21—"40 privates, class 3, \$720 each." Under the law organizing the department there are but two classes, a first class and a second class, and this provides a new class and fixes the salary at \$720 each. It is clearly new legislation and subject to a point of order.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the law to which the gentleman refers is chapter 623 of the statutes of the Fifty-sixth Congress, and reads as follows:

The Metropolitan police force shall consist of 1 major and superintendent, 1 captain and assistant superintendent, and such number of captains, lieutenants, sergeants, privates of class 2, privates of class 1, desk sergeants, and others as Congress may from time to time provide.

We claim that this class 3, the need of which is easy to establish, comes under the expression "and others," and therefore is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The statute, as it appears, has undertaken to settle how many classes of policemen there shall be—class 1 and class 2—and then there is a designation of lieutenants, sergeants, etc. It seems to the Chair that it would be a stretch of the words "and others" to say that those words authorize the creation of a third class. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BABCOCK. I desire to offer an amendment, to come in in line 19 of page 3, to strike out the word "forty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eighty." The effect of this will be to provide 280 policemen of the class named instead of 240, thus providing for the 40 that have been stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. McCLEARY. An amendment is being prepared which will cover this point, and I believe be clearly within the rule. It will be ready in a moment. [A pause.] Mr. Chairman, for the language which has gone out on a point of order I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] offer his amendment?

Mr. BABCOCK. I understand this is offered as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. McCLEARY. It is offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It will accomplish the same result.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 20, after the word "each," the following:  
"For 40 additional privates of class 1, who shall receive \$720 per annum each."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make a point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It changes existing law. The salary of privates of class 1 is at present, I believe, \$900. This amendment proposes to change the salary to \$720.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call attention to the fact that this is a reduction of salary, not an increase.

Mr. BABCOCK. Do I understand the gentleman from New

York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] is a change of existing law?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has made that point of order, and the Chair is ready to rule on it. The Chair overrules the point of order. Now, the Chair desires to know what becomes of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK]?

Mr. BABCOCK. I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is offered as a substitute for my proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well; the question then is on the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee [Mr. McCLEARY].

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to call attention to what is proposed by this amendment. There are at present two classes of policemen in this District, known as classes 1 and 2. This amendment provides for 40 additional privates of a class now receiving \$900 a year, but who under this amendment will receive \$720 a year. Is that the amendment?

Mr. McCLEARY. The amendment enlarges the number in this class and reduces the salary for the added number. It is clearly within the rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I submit to the Chair that this is practically creating a new class, and is subject to the same objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has overruled that point of order. The question is now on the merits of the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. McCLEARY was agreed to.

Mr. BABCOCK. The substitute proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota being now agreed to, as I understand, I withdraw my proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. PEARRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we return to page 6 to consider the clause between lines 14 and 20. My purpose is to ask some information from the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PEARRE] asks unanimous consent to return to lines 14 to 20, on page 6, for the purpose of asking information of the chairman of the committee. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCLEARY. It is understood that this consent is granted for the single purpose of enabling the gentleman to ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

Mr. PEARRE. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what the receipts of the office of sealer of weights and measures are?

Mr. McCLEARY. I have not the figures at hand; I simply remember that the office is self-supporting.

Mr. PEARRE. As I recall the figures, the receipts last year were something like \$6,670. Now, I should like to know the gross salaries paid to this bureau, if I may so call it.

Mr. McCLEARY. The amount is named in the bill which the gentleman has before him—\$6,080.

Mr. PEARRE. So that the receipts barely pay all the expenses of the bureau.

Mr. McCLEARY. They covered the expenses of the bureau and more.

Mr. PEARRE. I would ask the gentleman whether he does not think that the salary of the sealer of weights and measures is too high, when he considers that the receipts of the office just barely pay him and his assistants, or whether he has not too many assistants; in other words, whether the expenses of this bureau are not greater than the services rendered are worth?

Mr. McCLEARY. The point raised by the gentleman may or may not be well taken, but the committee has no option. The salary is fixed by law.

Mr. PEARRE. The committee has the right to recommend the reduction of those salaries by an amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not where it is fixed by law.

Mr. PEARRE. I would say to the chairman of the committee that I would have offered an amendment to this section if I had been here at the time that portion of the bill was read. I merely now suggest to the committee that it might be well to reduce those salaries or curtail the number of assistants.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the major and superintendent of the Metropolitan police, upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia, sums of money, not exceeding \$300 at one time, to be used only for the prevention and detection of crime, and to be accounted for monthly on itemized vouchers to the accounting officers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that paragraph, commencing at line 3 and ending with line 10. I wish to say to the gentleman in charge of the bill that if he will frame an amendment to make this money available for the purpose of bringing into the District fugitives from justice,



which I understand is the object of the provision, I will make no objection to it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is just what this section does. It was framed for that very purpose and that is just what it does.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But it makes this money available for other purposes. If says "for the prevention and detection of crime." If they can use \$300 at a time without any restriction upon the amount during the fiscal year, it is apt to lead to abuses which it would be better to prevent right now.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The sum of \$300 was named. It is a mere nominal sum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that under the language of this provision \$300 could be demanded and drawn every day.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But does not the gentleman remember to have heard read the provision of the section that this money must be accounted for on proper vouchers?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; but the language of this provision is "for the prevention and detection of crime." That covers a very, very wide field.

Mr. CANNON. And of course we are against the detection of crime and its prevention!

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know what the gentleman is opposed to, but I am opposed to putting this provision in in this way. The hearings before the committee show the purpose for which this money is wanted, and nobody has asked for this appropriation for the purpose stated in the bill.

Mr. McCLEARY. We recognize, Mr. Chairman, that it is subject to the point of order if the gentleman determines to press it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest just a word to the gentleman from New York, as his remarks seem to indicate he has a wrong impression of what this is for. Now, if a crime is committed in the District, as was explained to the committee, and the criminal flees and gets outside of the District, there is no fund with which to send a man after him and bring him back into the District. The money will not be advanced under the law as it is now until the criminal is within the District, within the jurisdiction of the officers and the courts of the District.

Now, if an officer goes after the criminal, he must necessarily advance his own expenses until he gets the criminal back, or else somebody must advance those expenses to bring back the criminal. Then whoever advances the money is reimbursed. Now, it was explained to the committee that by making \$300 available to send a man out to bring back a criminal, that sum would be reimbursed; and that \$300 turns over and over and does the work throughout the whole year. It is for the apprehension and bringing back of criminals into the District, where the law will provide for the recoupment of this fund. In short, it is for the detection and apprehension of criminals, and that is the only way we could see by which to express it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I stated at the beginning of what I said that I had no objection to an item for that purpose, but I do object to the present provision in the bill. I stated that if the gentleman in charge of the bill would prepare an amendment—

Mr. BURKETT. In what way does the gentleman desire to express it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman in charge of the bill would prepare an amendment which would make this money available for the expenses of men detailed to go out of the District to bring back fugitives from justice, there would be no objection on my part; but this makes it possible to secure an advance of \$300 for the "prevention and detection of crime."

Mr. BURKETT. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And it is customary in a great many cities of the country, I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT], to use money for the purpose of instigating criminals to act in order to bring charges against them. It has grown to be a great abuse in some of the great cities of the country, and it is quite unnecessary to give to the present police officials of this city the same opportunity and power to abuse discretion placed in them.

Mr. BURKETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman any other way of expressing it? We expressed it as clearly as we could possibly express it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe the gentleman in his statement said this money was to be advanced for the purpose of paying the expenses of officers sent out of the District to bring back fugitives from justice. I think that is very clearly stated.

Mr. BURKETT. There is nothing else contemplated. There is another place in the bill and another fund—

Mr. FITZGERALD. If there is nothing else contemplated, why not limit it to that by stating it in that language?

Mr. BURKETT. What way does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has already stated it and I have repeated it.

Mr. BURKETT. Will the gentleman send up his amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why, I am not desirous of perfecting the bill.

Mr. BURKETT. I suggest that we pass this temporarily and let the gentleman prepare an amendment such as he suggests.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say to the gentleman that I will not prepare an amendment. It was not put in there by me.

Mr. McCLEARY. I think that by changing the phraseology slightly the objection to the rule will be removed. I move to strike out in line 3, page 39, the word "hereafter," and insert instead thereof the words—

In expending the foregoing sum—

So that this will be a limitation upon the expenditure of the foregoing sum; so that it will read—

That in expending the foregoing sum the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman send up the amendment, so that the Clerk can read it to the committee?

The Clerk reads as follows:

In line 3, page 39, strike out "hereafter" and insert in lieu thereof "in expending the foregoing sum."

Mr. McCLEARY. That makes it a limitation upon the expenditure of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment proposed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have made a point of order against the whole section as it stands, and I insist on the point of order. I submit to the Chair that no amendment can be offered to a provision with a point of order pending. The Chair must determine that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled out the entire paragraph. It is no longer a part of the bill. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] now proposes to insert a paragraph at the same point in the bill where the obnoxious one was stricken out.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the Clerk will report that amendment, then we will be able to determine about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for the information of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

That in expending the foregoing sum the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the major and superintendent of the Metropolitan police, upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia, sums of money, not exceeding \$300 at one time, to be used only for the prevention and detection of crime, and to be accounted for monthly on itemized vouchers to the accounting officers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Chair regards this proposition now as a limitation upon the expenditure of the money heretofore appropriated in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the money heretofore authorized to be expended is all of it specifically appropriated for some other purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Then there will be no money available to expend under this. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For flags and balyards for station horses, \$125.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 12, page 39, the words "twenty-five" and insert "fifty." Before that amendment is put, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill [Mr. McCLEARY] a question. How much does this bill appropriate for the opening and improving of Sixteenth street?

Mr. McCLEARY. I would answer the gentleman by saying that it appropriates nothing.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable embarrassment that I criticize my colleagues for their action in reporting this bill, but there is hardly a gentleman in this House who is not familiar with Sixteenth street and who does not know of the years that that legislation has been considered before this House. I want to say that we have just paid the sum of \$629,000 for right of way for opening that street, which leads from the front door of the White House to the District line, and for two years practically nothing has been appropriated to open or grade that great thoroughfare, which is intended to be the most magnificent boulevard in the city of Washington, if not in the world.

Gentlemen are constantly coming to the Committee on the District of Columbia and asking what they shall do with their property, saying that the street runs through it; that they want to build; that they want to improve what they have left. The only answer I can make is that no appropriation has been made for removing the buildings or grading and improving the street.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, I desire to call your attention to some other items in this bill. Here is the estimate for the necessary amounts required for the streets and avenues, \$200,000; the amount appropriated in the committee bill is \$50,000. Another item, construction of county roads, estimated at \$200,000; the amount appropriated, \$54,500. For the improvement of Rock Creek Park, \$100,000.

Why, Mr. Chairman, time and again I have driven through that beautiful park and wondered and wondered why it was allowed to remain in its natural state when the opportunity for developing it into one of the most beautiful parks in this section of country is afforded; and now, Mr. Chairman, for the maintenance and improvement of that park an appropriation is made of \$2,500. Think of it! Twenty-five hundred dollars! Why, other cities, the cities of the great States of Illinois, New York, and Ohio, are appropriating not only hundreds of thousands of dollars, but millions of dollars, for purposes of this character and the benefit of the people who reside there. What is Congress doing for the poor that have no public parks to go to—\$2,500! Think of it! Rock Creek Park requires the sum asked for, \$100,000. The amount appropriated is \$2,500. I do not want to take up the time of the committee, but I want to call the attention of the House to the general policy that has been pursued in reporting this bill. I find that this bill carries \$600,000 for the filtration plant, while I believe the Commissioners asked for something like \$1,400,000. Take the provision for sewerage, another extraordinary appropriation. It is \$47,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like attention just a moment. I want to make this point here: That the policy in reporting this bill is—

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me just at that point?

Mr. BABCOCK. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me until I conclude my statement. I would be glad to answer a question.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the gentleman know that for the filtration plant, on a revised estimate and full information, that the gentleman in charge of the expenditure of the money says that this bill carries every dollar that can be expended in the coming fiscal year? And does not the gentleman know, further, that this appropriation for the sewerage system covers every cent that can be expended for the coming fiscal year for the sewerage system, the heart of it, that must be done before this system can be utilized?

Mr. BABCOCK. The gentleman misunderstands my remarks. I was calling attention to the extraordinary expenditures. What I said in reference to the Rock Creek Park was entirely in a different line.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it is all that was asked for.

Mr. BABCOCK. I have no criticism on the appropriation for those projects. I criticized the park appropriation for maintenance and improvement, and then I was starting in to show that other items were necessarily made small on account of the extraordinary appropriations, but the gentleman interrupted me before I had time to explain my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended, because I would like to ask him another question right there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the committee that this is general debate on the bill. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BABCOCK. I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the filtration plant and the sewage disposal system, \$1,247,000, as an extraordinary appropriation, an appropriation that is not in the class of the ordinary expenses of the city, and the bill also carries in addition other sums that I have not time to discuss and which it is not necessary for me to point out at this time. But the policy of the committee that has reported this bill, Mr. Chairman, is the point on which I wish to speak, and that is, that no appropriation shall be made until the tax levy has first been made up and the money raised to pay it. Am I correct?

Mr. McCLEARY. We are trying to keep the District from going further into debt. The gentleman is correct as to that point.

Mr. BABCOCK. I am correct on that.

Now, Congress has appropriated for several other large and extensive improvements—the sewerage system, the filtration plant, the municipal building, the union station, and some others carrying large sums of money, amounting in gross to a number of millions of dollars.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that if we pursue this policy that these large appropriations, the extraordinary appropriations must be met out of the current revenues of the District, and it

means that within ten years grass will be growing in the streets of Washington; it means, further, that we will be like a country town instead of setting a pattern to the world as the greatest capital of the greatest nation on earth.

I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, that I never knew of a constituent of a member of this House who would criticize his member's action or his vote for a liberal, decent appropriation for this great capital. When they come here they say, "This is our capital." And the Committee on the District of Columbia has stood here to maintain it as the capital of the 80,000,000 people of this country. I say, Mr. Chairman—and I regret to criticize my colleague—this is a cheeseparing policy that means necessary shrinking and shriveling and retarding the development of this great city.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a statement, and I will have it inserted in the RECORD, showing something like 100 items, from \$1,000 up to \$250,000, that have been cut out of the estimates, when more than half of them are absolutely necessary to the welfare and the development of the city. I want to say that if this policy is pursued, these extraordinary appropriations must be paid out of the current revenues, and that necessary appropriations will have to be cut down and eliminated from this and future District of Columbia appropriation bills. There are dozens and dozens of items here that are eliminated from the bill, and I do not believe there is a member of the committee who would say that they ought not to be appropriated for if there were funds to do so.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer this statement in connection with my remarks, and to give notice at this time that the Committee on the District of Columbia has reported an amendment to the present law which will be called up in this House at a later day, and which covers this whole subject in detail, giving the amount of all the revenues of the District, the amount of the projects that are provided under law, etc., and the proposed legislation authorizes the National Government to advance to the District of Columbia such sums as are appropriated by Congress that the current revenues do not supply. The General Government has already advanced to the District of Columbia about \$2,000,000, and the resolution provides that the total sum advanced shall not exceed \$10,000,000, to be repaid at the rate of \$500,000 a year for twenty years, with interest at the rate of 2 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The following is the statement referred to:

Items cut down and omitted, District appropriation bill, 1904.

	Recommended by Commissioners.	Approved by sub-committee.
Surveyor's office .....	\$21,484	\$17,800
Resurvey District boundary line .....	1,500	No.
Purchase of Latimore field notes .....	7,500	No.
Putting in shape records of permit clerk's office .....	500	No.
Assessment and permit work .....	175,000	145,000
Work on streets and avenues .....	200,000	50,000
Grading streets, alleys, and roads .....	10,000	8,000
Condemnation streets, alleys, and roads .....	1,000	No.
Opening alleys .....	25,000	10,000
Construction of county roads .....	200,000	54,500
Repairs to county roads .....	100,000	80,000
Connecticut avenue bridge .....	100,000	No.
Reconstructing Anacostia bridge .....	100,000	No.
Continuing Arizona avenue sewer .....	75,000	No.
Sewage disposal, pumping station .....	125,000	25,000
Ivy City trunk sewer .....	50,000	No.
Takoma Park sewer .....	150	No.
Draining 10 houses in District into Takoma, Md., sewer .....	100	No.
Parking commission .....	40,000	25,000
Care of grounds around municipal buildings .....	1,000	No.
Rock Creek Park .....	100,000	2,500
Contingent expenses, water department .....	3,000	2,500
Office inspector of buildings, additional employees asked for .....	5	1
Draftsman and clerk, inspector of plumbing .....	2	No.
Streets:		
Sprinkling, sweeping, and cleaning .....	205,000	100,000
Cleaning snow and ice .....	5,000	1,000
Disposal of city refuse .....	102,460	115,000
Collection of ashes from business establishments .....	35,000	-----
Harbor and river front .....	8,480	3,000
Electrical department:		
Rebuilding grounded and worn-out police patrol circuits .....	20,000	7,500
Lighting .....	219,700	200,000
Electric arc lighting .....	77,400	76,000
Washington Aqueduct:		
Building combined storehouse and stable at Great Falls .....	3,000	-----
Surveys for additional conduit from Great Falls .....	8,000	-----
Filtration plant .....	1,468,495	600,000
Public schools:		
Rent of school buildings and repair shop .....	17,000	15,684
Repairs to school buildings and grounds .....	75,000	55,000
Grading, paving, and draining school yards .....	5,000	-----
Purchase of tools, machinery, etc., for manual training schools .....	20,000	15,000
Contingent expenses .....	45,000	35,000
Repairing school furniture .....	3,000	-----



Items cut down and omitted, District appropriation bill, 1904—Continued.

	Recom- mended by Commis- sioners.	Approved by sub- commit- tee.
<b>Public schools—Continued.</b>		
Vacation schools .....	\$2,000	-----
Public playground .....	7,028	-----
Medical inspectors of public schools .....	5,500	-----
Construction Business High School .....	175,000	\$75,000
Extension McKinley Manual Training School .....	135,000	-----
Purchase of lot adjoining McKinley Manual Training School .....	5,000	-----
Purchase of lot 25, square 553, adjoining Arm- strong Manual Training School .....	3,933	-----
Construction of building in second division .....	48,000	-----
Construction of building in sixth division .....	48,000	-----
4-room addition to Takoma School .....	27,000	20,000
4-room manual training school, northwest corner Seventh and G streets SE .....	25,000	-----
<b>Police department:</b>		
Rent of police department headquarters and prop- erty storerooms .....	2,700	2,400
Roadway and protection wall along east side seventh precinct station house .....	500	-----
Remodeling rooms in first, second, third, fourth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth precinct sta- tion houses .....	25,000	-----
Janitor for police headquarters .....	720	-----
Station house at Tenallytown .....	10,000	-----
NOTE.—The Commissioners deem that all ap- propriations for the harbor master's force, and for all expenditures incident to the service under the surveillance of that office, be made under the head of "Harbor patrol" and immediately fol- low the item for "Miscellaneous expenses," etc., of the police department and embrace the fol- lowing:		
<b>For harbor patrol:</b>		
For 1 captain in the police department, who shall also be harbor master for the District of Colum- bia .....	1,800	-----
For 2 sergeants, who shall be licensed pilots, one for day and one for night work, at \$1,080 each .....	2,160	-----
For 2 engineers, at \$900 each .....	1,800	-----
For 2 firemen, at \$480 each .....	960	-----
For 1 janitor .....	480	-----
For desk sergeant .....	1,080	-----
For fuel, construction, maintenance and repairs, labor, and incidentals .....	2,000	-----
And the major and superintendent of the Met- ropolitan police shall hereafter be charged with the enforcement of all laws and regulations relat- ing to the harbor, and employ the captain, force, and means provided for this service in the execution of the duties appertaining thereto.		
<b>Fire department:</b>		
Repairs to engine houses, etc .....	10,000	7,500
Fuel .....	7,500	4,500
Forage .....	17,000	12,000
Contingent expenses .....	18,000	14,000
Chemical Engine Company in Benning, D. C. ....	23,000	-----
Purchase chemical engine and hose wagons .....	10,000	6,000
<b>Health department:</b>		
Enforcement of provisions of act to prevent spread of scarlet fever, diphtheria, etc. ....	30,000	25,000
Traveling expenses of sanitary and food inspect- ors .....	1,500	1,000
Enforcement of provisions of act for the removal of weeds .....	5,000	-----
Purchase of site for pound and stable .....	10,000	-----
Erection and equipment of pound and stable .....	15,000	-----
Erection and equipment of stable for the smallpox hospital .....	1,000	-----
Wrists of lunacy .....	5,000	1,500
<b>Charities and corrections:</b>		
<b>Washington Asylum—</b>		
Repairs to buildings, plumbing, etc .....	3,500	2,000
Continuing erection of workhouse for males ..	102,000	-----
Erection of municipal almshouse .....	125,000	-----
Erection of temporary building for treatment of patients suffering from tuberculosis .....	10,000	-----
<b>Reform School—</b>		
Repairs .....	2,000	1,500
New family building .....	25,000	-----
Furnishing new building .....	1,500	-----
<b>Reform School for Girls—</b>		
Building to house men employees .....	6,000	-----
Garfield Hospital .....	19,000	-----
Providence Hospital .....	19,000	-----
Children's Hospital .....	12,000	10,000
Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital .....	16,000	15,000
Erection of municipal hospital .....	250,000	-----
<b>Board of Children's Guardians—</b>		
Maintenance of feeble-minded children .....	12,000	11,000
Board and care of children .....	40,000	35,000

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] have such time as he desires, say, ten minutes, or fifteen minutes.

Mr. McCLEARY. Ten minutes will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota have ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the spirit in which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] speaks.

The members of the Committee on Appropriations are just as desirous that this shall be a beautiful city, worthy to be the capital of this great nation, as he or anyone else can be. But we have seen money expended in cities all over the country to their great embarrassment in the future. I was struck by an expression in an editorial of the Post the other morning, which immediately followed one rather criticising the committee for the smallness of the appropriation. In the editorial occurs this suggestive thought: "The one thing we leave to our children is debt." It was speaking of customary municipal management. The committee desires to avoid that, if it can be done without cramping the growth of the city and without "cheeseparing."

My friend from Wisconsin was quite facetious regarding the parks. If there is anything in which this city glories, it is its parks. If there is anything with which it is well furnished, it is with parks. You can not walk ten blocks in any direction without coming upon one or more beautiful parks.

My friend spoke slightly of our estimate of the value of Rock Creek Park, mentioning the fact that we had appropriated for that park only \$2,500. Anyone who drives up in Rock Creek Park will discover that a large part of it, that part below the military road, is in good condition.

Mr. BABCOCK. I want to say to my friend that the pineries in Wisconsin were in good condition before the ax of man ever touched them.

Mr. McCLEARY. Below this military road, I was saying, the drives are good, and, as my friend suggests, the pineries of his State were beautiful before they were touched. The illustration is "not half bad." We believe that in "nature unadorned" is much of beauty, and that man sometimes takes away rather than adds to the beauty by trimming and cutting too much.

But the point I desire to make, Mr. Chairman, is this: The work upon that park is done by inmates of the workhouse. The appropriation of \$2,500 made in the bill is for administration purposes. We do not need to provide large sums for carrying on the work itself, because that is done by those we are caring for by public bounty and whose expenses are met in another part of the bill.

My friend speaks slightly of our dealing with the city in the matter of streets. Permit me to remind him that by personal inspection we discovered that streets were estimated for which are now paved in a way which would be regarded in any other city in the world as splendid. What was the proposition? To tear up the present pavement and substitute another. Take, for example, Louisiana avenue between Fifth and Seventh, which stood either first or second on the list, as arranged "in order of importance." When you reach the fountain going home to-night, where Seventh street crosses the Avenue, turn and look toward the court-house and see what kind of a pavement it is.

It is a fine block pavement, in excellent condition, and the proposition was to take up that excellent pavement—and I use the word advisedly, an excellent pavement—take that up and substitute for it another kind of pavement. I would be willing to leave it to the membership of this House, if they will go and examine it, as we did; and I would be willing to offer an amendment to the bill such as the gentleman from Wisconsin seems to want if 95 per cent of this House did not say that is a good pavement and ought to be allowed to remain as it is. If there are 5 per cent of the membership of this House who will say that we did wrong in cutting out any such change as that, then I shall be willing to accept an amendment from my friend to make the change he suggests.

This is not "cheeseparing," Mr. Chairman; it is simply square, honest prudence, such as we exercise in our own personal affairs, that this committee has tried to exercise in the affairs of this District.

When, in going down Pennsylvania avenue, you reach the corner of Tenth street and look south on Tenth street, down toward the Smithsonian Institution, you will find on that piece of street a piece of pavement that was marked as the most imperative among the wants of the District for improvement. Look at the street; it is splendidly paved with granite blocks. What is that part of the street used for? For the business of commission houses—for heavy draying. What better pavement than the very granite blocks which are already there? And it is in good condition, barring a few places where there has been excavation, I judge, for sewers or something of that kind.

If gentlemen of this House could go with us and examine one by one the streets that we have passed upon, I feel confident that invariably, or at least ninety-five times out of a hundred, they would say that the committee did wisely and well.

My friend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] very properly directed attention to the extension of the water system—for the filtration of the water—and pointed out that, while it is true that \$1,400,000 is needed for the completion of the plant, no one proposes to complete that plant this

year. It could not be done if all the money were placed at the disposal of the gentleman in charge of the improvement, Colonel Miller, of the War Department. We brought him before us and asked him how much money he could use properly and prudently this year.

Mr. BABCOCK. I made no criticism at all on that improvement.

Mr. McCLEARY. Why did you mention it, then?

Mr. BABCOCK. Because it was for extraordinary purposes, outside of the usual expenses of the District, and because it was argued that as you had to appropriate this large sum of money, therefore it was necessary to cut down these ordinary appropriations. That appropriation is all right; I made no criticism of it at all. It had to be made.

Mr. McCLEARY. I agree with the gentleman when he states as a general proposition that extraordinary expenses which can not be met from the revenues of a given year, and yet which must be provided for, should be provided for by spreading the expenditure over a series of years. This can be done, either by saving from an income from year to year till the required sum is "saved up," or by borrowing money payable through a series of years.

But when we have the money—when we have \$5,419,000 of District funds raised by taxation—why borrow, especially when we remember that the taxes thus raised are only  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on a two-thirds valuation, amounting practically to 1 per cent, a burden that is not grievous at all, a burden less than we carry in our own home towns. For this taxation covers everything—covers what would be counted in our homes under the heads of State, county, municipal, school, all the items of taxation. All these expenses in this District, as I have said, amount to only  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on a two-thirds valuation, which is equivalent to 1 per cent.

Now, I repeat, when we have right in our own hands the means with which to provide reasonably for extraordinary expenses as they come along and provide reasonably for current expenses, why deliberately run in debt? The policy of the committee is to treat this city generously. We are just as proud as anyone can be of this city as the capital of this country. We want it to be a great and glorious and beautiful city, and we believe that twenty years hence the men who then reside here will be grateful to us for being prudent to-day in expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT].

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] has five minutes remaining.

Mr. BURKETT. I think that will be enough. Mr. Chairman, in these five minutes I want to reply briefly and directly to the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK]. His main criticism in support of his \$10,000,000 loan proposition, which he tells us he will call up soon, has been upon the Appropriations Committee charged with the preparation of this bill, for leaving out, as he says, a great many items that should have been attended to and appropriated for.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this committee maintains that there is on a single dollar of appropriation that should have been made for the care of the lives and property and the welfare and comfort and protection of the people of the District of Columbia that has not been appropriated. This is not a "cheeseparing bill," as he denominates it.

Mr. BABCOCK. How about Sixteenth street?

Mr. BURKETT. I will tell the gentleman all about that. I will read every one of these items that he mentions and discuss their merits.

We have not "skimped" in any particular. And let me say further that within the revenue now available for the District of Columbia there is almost \$5,000,000 that can be devoted and will be devoted to permanent improvements within the District. In this bill, carrying something over \$7,000,000 for running this District, there is included over one and three-fourths million dollars in the way of street extension, in the way of sewer building and extension, in the way of extending and improving the waterworks system and filtration plant, in building schoolhouses, and adding books to the library, and that sort of thing.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin has brought in here a statement of several items, and has filed it and made it a part of his remarks, which he says we ought to have appropriated for, and did not. I will begin at the first. For instance, he says that in the surveyor's office, where the Commissioners have recommended an appropriation of \$22,484, we have appropriated only \$17,800. Ah! a misstatement by the juggling of figures or possibly a misapprehension of the facts. We appropriated every dollar that the Commissioners asked for, aside from raise in salaries. But we declined to appropriate it in the manner that they asked. And now gentlemen come in here and juggle with the figures for the

purpose of making the House and the people of this District believe that we have not provided properly for that office.

Now, why? Turn over here in the Book of Estimates and you will find that the Commissioners wanted to load onto the District by way of salaries the difference between \$17,000 and \$21,000, \$4,000 worth of salaried officers, and put them on the salary list. The committee says, "We will leave them as they have been for years. The law has provided who are salaried officers and who shall be on the salary list. These others you can employ on a per diem basis as you need them," and we appropriated that amount of money and put it into the contingent fund, thus permitting them to employ those people on a per diem basis.

Mr. BABCOCK. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I made no mention of that item.

Mr. BURKETT. But it is in the list here.

Mr. BABCOCK. Every item in the bill is in the list.

Mr. BURKETT. Now, take the next one. The next item that he criticises us for not appropriating for is \$1,500 to resurvey the District boundaries. We had a hearing on this particular matter. What is this? They propose that somebody should make a resurvey, should go around the District and set stones down along the District line which will be thicker than the stones there now. We asked if there were not there stones occasionally now marking the boundary. "Yes; but whenever a man goes out to survey from the District line," was the reply, "he has to go away over there and find the stone before he knows where the line is." It is only a question of how many stones we put out there. That is the whole business. They know where that line is; it is already marked; it can be found whenever it is wanted. In fact, we pay these surveyors for that purpose, and when they go out to find the District line they can find it. It is possible for them to find it by hunting for it, from the stones already there.

Mr. McCLEARY. And by not going very far, either.

Mr. BURKETT. Yes; by not going very far either, as the evidence shows. The next proposition is for the purchase of the Lattimore field notes, \$7,500, and he criticises the committee for not appropriating that. Now, what are the Lattimore field notes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Nebraska be extended for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman be extended for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKETT. Now, as I was about to say, there is a man named Lattimore who is employed down here in the surveyor's office. He has an old set of field notes that, as the evidence shows, was of more or less value when they went into that particular portion of the city to look up some old title, but for years, ever since he has been employed in the District office, the District has been using these field notes. That fact probably has been taken into consideration in respect to his employment in fixing his salary. In the judgment of the committee that was not wise, it was not necessary, it was not proper at this time to appropriate to buy those field notes, because resurveys are being made, and in the course of time they may not be needed at all.

Now, the next proposition which the gentleman criticises the committee for is because it does not appropriate \$500 for putting in shape the records of the permit clerk's office. That is allowed in the contingent fund. It is under the executive department, and they can put those records in shape out of that contingent fund. The next proposition is for not allowing \$175,000 under assessment and permit work. Now, we allowed \$145,000, which is current law, the same as we allowed last year. In the appropriation bill of last year we increased the sum \$5,000. The year before it had been \$140,000 and we raised it to \$145,000, and this year we allowed current law.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? What is the annual increase in growth in taxation in the city of Washington?

Mr. BURKETT. Well, it was a good deal last year, under the tax law, which some people did not like.

Mr. BABCOCK. No; but for a period of years—say the past five or ten years.

Mr. BURKETT. I have not it.

Mr. BABCOCK. It exceeds 10 per cent, the appropriation does, practically, every year; 5 to 10 per cent.

Mr. BURKETT. What does?

Mr. BABCOCK. The increase in the appropriations—the natural growth of the city. Does the gentleman expect to maintain an appropriation which was fixed last year or five years ago or ten years ago, indefinitely?

Mr. BURKETT. We do, probably, on this sort of special work, because we are completing this work—the special work—every year. It does not grow any more one year than another. That is the growth; that is what this \$145,000 represents.



Mr. BABCOCK. The total estimates, including water department, for 1893, were \$6,717,865.43, and the total estimates for 1903, including the water department, were \$10,767,497.97.

Mr. BURKETT. That is on account of the \$1,500,000 tax law that we put on in connection with this bill last year.

Now, the next proposition is \$200,000 that was asked for streets and avenues, on which we allowed \$50,000. That is considerable of a cut, but the streets of Washington are paved according to a schedule made several years ago. When the Commissioners came before the committee, we asked if that was the schedule they would follow. We thought possibly conditions might change and there might be some streets that would come into prominence or would come into a condition of being necessary to be paved, which a few years ago had not been.

So we asked the Commissioners to revise the list of streets that should be paved in this District, that we might see what were the most important, and we said: "Put in your list the streets that need paving the most, the most important street first, the second most important street next, and so on." And when they brought us that revised list, what do you suppose the first one was? The first one on the list was Louisiana avenue, paved with granite-block pavement, going down the hill southwest from the city offices. The committee went over and investigated, and they said that if that was the most important thing to be paved, when we needed our money and could better use it in other directions, it was not proper to permit a bonding or a borrowing scheme for this District in order to tear up granite-block pavement and substitute asphalt for it.

One of the streets was down here in the wholesale district—Tenth street from Pennsylvania avenue south. We went down there and we never saw a thing but drays and wagons, wholesale houses, a lot of little manufactories, and that sort of thing. Any business man who would go down and investigate it to see what it ought to be paved with would say that it ought to be paved with granite blocks. So we did cut down this item. We thought if that was the most important thing they needed in the way of pavements we could use the money to better advantage in extending the sewers, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] criticised us for doing.

Now, the next thing was the grading of streets and alleys. They asked for \$10,000 and we allowed \$8,000 for the extending and grading of streets and alleys. That is another one of these things that is carried along every year for the growth and development of the city, and we gave current law. So I might go on down through the list, but I am not going to take the time to do so.

Mr. BABCOCK. Get down to the parks.

Mr. BURKETT. Yes, I will get down to the parks. The gentleman called special attention to Rock Creek Park, and then he threw in those few sympathetic words for the poor people of the District of Columbia. But he has not suggested, and the Commissioners of the District have not suggested, a single improvement in Rock Creek Park that would be for the benefit of the poor people of the District of Columbia. What are the improvements contemplated? They are the building of driveways that you can roll over with your magnificent carriages and teams. There is not an improvement contemplated in Rock Creek Park that is for the benefit of the poor people that the gentleman from Wisconsin is so anxious about.

Now, with reference to this parking matter, we did not appropriate as much as they asked us for the improvement of Rock Creek Park. That is true, but we have appropriated for parks all over this District. There are parks from one end of it to the other.

Mr. BABCOCK. In this bill?

Mr. BURKETT. Yes; in this bill. We have appropriated for the care and the maintenance and the beautifying of every park in this District. The committee also appropriated as much as they thought was necessary for the care of Rock Creek Park.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman call attention to the different items of appropriation for the parks of this city in the bill?

Mr. BURKETT. We appropriated \$25,000 in this bill for the parking commission.

Mr. BABCOCK. But not for the parks.

Mr. BURKETT. Then, in the sundry civil bill there is also carried—

Mr. BABCOCK. The gentleman stated that they had appropriated for all the parks in the city in this bill. I should like to have him show us a single item.

Mr. BURKETT. We have appropriated for everything that belongs in this bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is another proposition.

Mr. BURKETT. And what we did not appropriate for in this bill will be taken care of in the sundry civil bill. The gentleman would not want us to duplicate in both bills, I think.

Another thing they criticise us for is the item for cleaning off ice

and snow. The Commissioners asked \$5,000 and the committee reported \$1,000. Why? Because whenever there is any ice or snow on the streets of this city Congress is always in session. Rather than make an appropriation of \$5,000, to be carried after next July until December, we simply appropriate \$1,000 in case of a little emergency. That is the way we have done for years.

Mr. BABCOCK. In case of a snowstorm the gentleman would suggest a special appropriation?

Mr. BURKETT. That is the way it has been done for years, and it has only been required occasionally; but whenever we have a severe snowstorm Congress is always in session, and it does not take very long to make provision. Now, here is one thing I want to call attention to, because it is along the same line of argument that they are making.

A man came to me on Saturday evening last, after hearing some such arguments and said he thought that there was a terrible calamity visited upon the District, that we had cut down the appropriations to such a degree as to be very disastrous to the District. When I told him that we had not cut down the appropriations for the water, for sewerage, for the repair of streets or cleaning them, or anything of that sort of thing he was surprised. When I told him that we had appropriated for every schoolhouse, and that when they had come and asked us for 40 policemen at \$50 we gave them 40 at \$60, he was surprised. When I told him that we had appropriated for all the fire apparatus that was asked for, he was amazed, for he had been misinformed.

There were some officers that asked to have some salaries raised, and it appears in the statement of the Commissioners before the subcommittee that, as a general proposition, they thought we should raise the salaries of the heads of departments first. The committee took another view of the matter.

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not think the gentleman wants to do me an injustice. I know I made no criticism about the salaries.

Mr. BURKETT. You have it right here in your paper as to what the committee did in the raise of the salaries.

Mr. BABCOCK. I made no criticism of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, our friend from Nebraska has shown a few details that we had rather expected to keep until next Monday, when the proposition for lending the District ten millions is to come up. It is well enough to do it now, and we will have some more of the same kind then.

Mr. BABCOCK. I hope it will be in the same line, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCLEARY. We will be with you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks that the time of the gentleman from Nebraska be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURKETT. These Commissioners came and they asked and they argued, that the salaries of each of the heads of the bureaus and departments might be raised. We did not raise these salaries. I do not think there are three exceptions to that statement. We have not raised any of the high-salaried clerks and officers of this District to speak of. What did we do? We took the drivers and laboring men who were receiving \$30 and \$40 a month and we raised them all up to \$50 a month. These are the only salaries, I will say, gentlemen, with possibly three exceptions, that this committee are recommending to raise.

Now, here is another item to which I desire to call attention. That out of an appropriation of \$125,000, as recommended by the Commissioners (that is, in this written statement), we only recommend \$25,000. Now, the Commissioners estimated that \$125,000. It was for the sewerage-disposal plant down here. When the Commissioners came before us and we asked the Engineer Commissioner how much money of last year's appropriation he had on hand, he began to figure, and he was surprised to find out how much money he had, and almost questioned whether he could expend it all in another year, and said that \$25,000 more would be all that he could expend and we gave the \$25,000.

In short, in conclusion, let me say we have appropriated on all of these improvements that the District has started on by legislation; we have appropriated every dollar—every dollar that has been asked for by the officers in charge of any of these public works. And let me say to the gentleman we have taken into consideration the amounts that it is going to cost for terminals, the highway bridge, the amount that it is going to cost for the District building, for the filtration plant, and the amount for all these things we have started out to build, and still we have enough revenue to-day to carry on the District business.

We are appropriating one and three-quarter millions for permanent improvements in this bill and three more millions of dollars are left for the other projects planned, of permanent improvements in the District. At that rate annually for the next twenty years, that the gentleman proposes to give the District to

pay off the \$10,000,000 loan, we will have \$80,000,000 to appropriate for permanent improvements over and beyond what it will cost to run the District alone.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman from Wisconsin present his amendment to the paragraph in seriousness?

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOR THE FIRE DEPARTMENT.

For chief engineer, who shall have had at least five years' actual experience as a member of some organized municipal fire department, \$2,000; 3 assistant chief engineers, at \$1,200 each; clerk, \$1,000; fire marshal, \$1,200; machinist, \$1,000; 26 foremen, at \$1,000 each; 14 engineers, at \$1,000 each; 14 firemen, at \$900 each; 7 tillermen, at \$900 each; 27 drivers, at \$900 each; 186 privates, at \$840 each; 26 watchmen, at \$600 each; and 1 laborer, at \$480; in all, \$264,320.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words in line 6, "who shall have had at least five years' actual experience as a member of some organized municipal fire department." I make it on the ground that it is new legislation, and in support of that I have last year's appropriation bill before me in which the language used is, "for chief engineer, \$2,000," precisely the same as the words in this bill, with the exception of the words against which I make the point of order. It is clearly a change of existing law and is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. McCLEARY. I have an amendment, Mr. Chairman, to offer which I think will meet the objection of the gentleman from Maryland.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 40, line 8, insert, after the word "dollars," the following: "This sum shall not be available to pay a chief engineer who has not had at least five years' experience as a member of some organized municipal fire department."

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against that amendment. If it were permissible to put in words in that way, by indirection or as a subterfuge, nothing would come of any point of order against language in a general appropriation bill amounting to new legislation or a change of existing law. It is not in any sense a limitation on the amount to be expended, and that is the only sense in which such a provision can be put upon an appropriation bill. The gentleman knows that it will accomplish the same thing. It is the same provision in new language. It is seeking to incorporate in a general appropriation bill new legislation, and the gentleman's amendment is the same as the words I object to, only in a modified form.

Mr. McCLEARY. I do not understand the gentleman from Maryland to question the wisdom of some such provision. He is objecting to the form of the phraseology. I am trying to meet his wishes rhetorically and bring this so it will be within the well-known rule whereby a limitation of an expenditure is in order. It is upon that ground I offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the effect of this language proposed in this amendment is the same as that which by consent was ruled out on a point of order. Going back as far as the able opinions delivered on this particular question by Chairman Dingley, the object sought is the real question, and the form of words is unimportant. In their form, in the opinion of the Chair, this language is a limitation upon the expenditure of money and legitimately proper. And while the present form is a much better one than the other, and less likely to challenge quotation in the future, the Chair would have overruled the point of order in the first instance, and he certainly does so now. [Laughter.] The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WARNOCK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bill of the following title:

On December 20, 1903:

H. R. 16642. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation additional land in rear of the present site of the truck house in square No. 928, in the southeast section of the city, at an expense not exceeding \$2,000, to be paid out of the appropriation heretofore made for said truck house.

In all, \$39,500.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of correcting a verbal error, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 41, line 23, strike out the word "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the necessary traveling expenses of sanitary and food inspectors while traveling outside of the District of Columbia for the purpose of inspecting dairy farms, milk, and other dairy products, \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word. A few minutes ago in discussing the Alaskan boundary, the distinguished and learned and generally accurate gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] said that a paltry amount of territory—

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I invite attention to the fact that the gentleman from Missouri is not discussing matters germane to the bill, and I raise the point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. The time I occupied was in the general debate; the time occupied by the gentleman from Iowa was in the five-minute debate. I will observe, however, in closing, that this point is generally made after a Republican orator has delivered himself, but never at any other time.

Mr. BURKETT. Let me correct the gentleman. The last orator to whom we have listened was on the Democratic side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Justices of the peace: For ten justices of the peace, at \$2,000 each, and the further sum of \$250 each for rent, stationery, and other expenses; in all, \$22,500.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph just read. By the District code bill, which was passed in the last Congress or the Congress preceding, provision was made for ten justices of the peace in the District of Columbia, and their salaries were fixed at \$3,000 a year. Now, the paragraph just read is either a change of existing law or it is a perfectly useless proceeding, because if it be not a change of existing law it simply relegates these justices to the Court of Claims to recover in each case \$1,000 salary not appropriated for.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very great piece of injustice against these justices of the peace, who accepted office in the face of the pledge of the law that they were to be paid \$3,000 a year. The code prohibits their practicing law, and compels them to turn into the District treasury all the fees and emoluments of their offices. They are therefore entirely dependent upon their salaries. While it is true that \$250 is allowed them for rent, stationery, and other expenses, it will be perfectly apparent to anybody who lives in the city of Washington that an allowance of \$250 a year to pay office rent, stationery, and other expenses is a mere bagatelle. I am told—of course I speak only from information—that after these justices are paid their salaries, cut down as provided for in this bill, they will receive no more in a year than a deputy marshal does who is occupied in keeping peace in their office.

And it is to be borne in mind that these gentlemen accepted these offices with the understanding that according to the reading of the law their salary was to be \$3,000 a year. I can not speak as to all of them, but I do know some cases where they entirely changed their mode of living, where they gave up the business that they had been previously pursuing, upon the faith of this \$3,000 salary. To cut down the salary in this way is an injustice to these gentlemen which I do not believe the Appropriations Committee wants to inflict.

Some gentlemen say, "Well, there ought not to be ten justices of the peace in the District of Columbia." I think perhaps that is true; but the proper way of making an amendment to that effect is by a revision of the law creating these ten justices, and not by violating the rules of the House in legislating on an appropriation bill.

What is the saving to be accomplished by this reduction? We save the sum of \$10,000 by cutting down the salaries of ten justices, when, as my friend representing the District Committee has assured us, the District treasury is just overflowing with money, so that there is a surplus of \$5,000,000. Under these circumstances the Committee on Appropriations wants to save \$10,000 by taking it out of the pockets of ten justices of the peace. Now, aside altogether from any question of order, I appeal to the sense of justice of the House to appropriate for these gentlemen what the law provides they shall receive.

I withdraw any pretense of a point of order, and I move to amend by inserting in line 2, page 47, the word "three" instead of the word "two" before the words "thousand dollars each." I move also to amend the total of the paragraph by adding to the amount \$10,000.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] moves to strike out "two" in line 2, page 47, and insert "three," so that the paragraph will read:

For ten justices of the peace, at \$3,000 each.

The gentleman moves further to amend by making the footing correspond with the amendment just stated.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] withdrew his point of order because he is too good a parliamentarian not to know that it would not lie, in view of the words "in full" in the opening paragraph of the bill. The bill appropriates "in full" for the purposes named. Therefore, whatever may be appropriated is all that the gentleman could get and no more.

On the 30th of June, 1902, a little over six months ago, we passed a revised code for this District. In that revision a provision was adopted reducing the number of these justices from ten to six. Why that reduction? Simply because it was felt that six is a sufficient number. The salaries of six justices, at \$3,000 a year, would amount to \$18,000 to be expended for this purpose. Under this bill we propose to expend \$20,000—a larger amount—for ten justices. The reduction of number provided for in the code is to take effect gradually, as the incumbents of these ten offices may resign or die. Not desiring to legislate any of these justices out of office, we provided for continuing the number; but, in view of the meagerness of the duties, we believe that a salary of \$2,000 is ample.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] has not answered my proposition, that these gentlemen are entitled to be appropriated for in accordance with the law. I differ with him entirely as to the duties of these officers being "meager." As far as I am concerned, I know only of the case of one of these gentlemen, but I know that his duties are onerous and that he earns the whole of the salary as fixed by law.

It may be that six justices are a sufficient number; I have no doubt that such is the fact; but, as I have said, the proper way to provide for the reduction in the number of justices is by revising the law. It is no proper function of an appropriation committee to undertake to adjust salaries, to put them up and put them down. A little while ago the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Munn] inquired of my friend the chairman of the subcommittee if he did not think the salary of the sealer of weights and measures was too high. The gentleman replied that that might be so, but that his committee had no alternative, that the law fixed the salary and it was their duty to make the appropriation.

Now, the same rule that applies there applies here. But I do not care anything about technicalities. I appeal to the sense of justice of this House and assert that men who accepted office upon a pledge written in the statute books that they would receive a certain amount of money per annum for their services are entitled to have that amount of money. The gentleman of whom I speak was appointed after the passage of the code and accepted office on the face of the code. I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. SHAFROTH. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How long has it been that the appropriation bills have carried \$2,000 per annum instead of \$3,000?

Mr. DALZELL. Last year and now this proposed here.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Those are the only two?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I should not have said a word about this matter were it not that I served upon the subcommittee last session of this Congress on the bill for the first appropriation, as I recollect, after the enactment of the code. We took up this matter and investigated it fully. We were much surprised to find that provision was in the code. Gentlemen understand how the District code is revised and how it was revised. We did it in a hurry—I do not know how many hundred pages there are, some one says 600 pages—and in about forty minutes' consideration. I doubt if the gentlemen who had charge of the code knew many things that were in it. We have been finding them out to our sorrow ever since, and I have no doubt that there are others to still follow after.

When we took up the first appropriation bill to provide for these ten justices of the peace, who had theretofore, as I recollect it, been feed officers, and not salaried officers, imagine our surprise to find that they wanted \$3,000 each for these ten justices of the peace, in addition to \$250 to pay the rent and for the stationery. We investigated the matter, and we found that six were more than there ought to be; so that, as I recollect it, we placed some provision upon the law which has been construed to mean that as these gentlemen go out of office the number shall be reduced to six, an ample number. We thought, as their stationery and office rent were paid—\$250, making in all \$2,250—that \$2,000 was a suf-

ficient salary for a man that, ordinarily, is like necessity—knowing no law. [Laughter.]

I must confess that I should not have said a word about it except in justification of our action then. I feel quite sure that before this legislation was had the salary was more than enough, from the many, many applications by mail and in person which I had—not from an army, but enough to make a respectable-sized company in a regiment which was agonizing to serve the country in this respect. I do not want to do any injustice, and did not when I figured this legislation—in effect, legislation reducing the number to six, as I have indicated, and reducing the salary for the current year to \$2,000. That is all they are getting now, and this proposed for the coming year that it shall be at \$2,000, with \$250 more. I have no doubt that my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] knows one very worthy man. I wish that we might reduce the number to four, which would be quite enough, and give the one worthy man my friend knows a little more and the others a little less.

Mr. DALZELL. I do not know him, I know of him.

Mr. CANNON. Yes? Well, upon the whole, I submit that \$2,250 is enough to pay by way of annual salary to a justice of the peace, when we have ten and do not need six.

Mr. DALZELL. My friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will agree with me that the proper place to amend that legislation is in the bill itself, and not in an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Well, we have already amended it by cutting the number down to six, to take effect when the first four go out of office. We amended it this year so that they will receive \$2,000 for the current year, and this proposes, not subject to a point of order, to continue that \$2,000 for the coming year. That is all I want to say.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I think my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will agree with me that it is no proper function of the Committee on Appropriations to cast aside the law and fix salaries, putting them up and putting them down, in their discretion. I agree with him and I am willing to concede that the code bill was passed hastily and perhaps without any very accurate knowledge on our part, but two wrongs do not make a right, and if we were guilty of carelessness in that case we ought to remedy that carelessness in the proper way.

Mr. CANNON. After all, I will say to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the main question is, first, have we the power for the coming fiscal year to continue the salary as it is this year? The answer is yes. Second, on the everlasting merits, or rather on the merits as they exist now, is \$2,250 enough?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DALZELL. Let us have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DALZELL) there were—ayes 19, noes 36.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INTEREST AND SINKING FUND.

For interest and sinking fund on the funded debt, \$975,408.

Any excess of said sum or of sums hereafter appropriated for this purpose, over and above the amount required for the payment of the interest on the funded debt of the District of Columbia, shall be applied by the Treasurer of the United States to the purchase and redemption of the bonds of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That should the Treasurer of the United States at any time be unable to secure bonds of the District of Columbia at a price which he may deem advantageous, he is hereby authorized to invest the amount available for the said sinking fund in bonds of the United States, the bonds so purchased to be registered in the name of the Treasurer of the United States, trustee for the sinking fund of the District of Columbia, and it shall be the duty of the Treasurer of the United States to collect the interest, when due, on the bonds so held, and to invest the same for account of said sinking fund: *Provided further*, That the Treasurer of the United States is hereby authorized, by exchange or by sale and reinvestment, to substitute bonds of the District of Columbia for the bonds of the United States so held when he shall deem it to be to the interest of the said sinking fund to do so.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The precision with which the appropriation contained in this paragraph is stated would lead to the supposition that the amount was arrived at by a mathematical calculation, for it appropriates the sum of \$975,408. Why it should appropriate this sum in such precise figures it is hard to understand, unless it was reached by a mathematical computation of some liability and unless provision was made for enough money to meet it.

Mr. McCLEARY. Does the gentleman desire an answer?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not right now. I assume, however, that such is not the case; for if that were true certainly there would be no necessity for the elaborate provision which is contained in the next paragraph, a provision which says that in the event that a surplus remains out of this appropriation, or out of any similar appropriation in the future, that surplus shall be used in purchasing the outstanding securities of the District of Columbia; and then it provides that if such securities can not be purchased at a

figure satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury such surplus shall then be invested in United States bonds and held as a trust fund against the public debt of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest to the gentleman one thing just there?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The purchase of the bonds of the District of Columbia is provided for here, but there are only a few of them and they are in the hands of strong men who could put up the price of those bonds to whatever point they pleased and force the District to pay that sum.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, I have no objection to purchasing those bonds, but I am at a loss to understand why we should appropriate a sum of money which leaves a surplus to be devoted to this purpose.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. A surplus is not appropriated, but in case there is a surplus then we take care of it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Assuredly if this large sum of \$975,408 is arrived at by computing a liability which must be met by the Treasury of the United States, then it is certainly true that if it is even approximately correct no considerable surplus can arise, and what should be the manner of its disposition, I was going to say, would be a matter almost of indifference.

But the care with which this provision is drawn and the elaborateness of its form would indicate that there is in this section provision having in view a surplus to be applied in this way. Now, I should like to ask the gentlemen of the committee a question. Can the gentleman in charge of the bill state in precise figures the amount of interest on indebtedness of the District of Columbia which is to be met out of this appropriation—the amount of the interest?

Mr. McCLEARY. I prefer to answer the gentleman in my own way after he is through.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want an answer now. I am not through. The gentleman took the floor, and I supposed he wanted to be interrogated.

Mr. McCLEARY. I thought you were just about through.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, I am not through.

Mr. McCLEARY. I will explain the paragraph when the gentleman takes his seat.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have no doubt the gentleman can explain it, and to the end that he may do it completely I will ask him to state separately how much of this will be applied upon the payment of an interest obligation. Does this paragraph have in view a surplus; and if so, how much? If the interest can be arrived at exactly, I ask why the Appropriations Committee did not bring in a bill appropriating precisely enough to pay the interest? What is the object in creating a surplus to buy at a premium the public debt of the District of Columbia in advance of its maturity?

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Missouri evidently did not read the title of this subdivision of the bill. It says:

Interest and sinking fund.

Now, we must provide in this bill enough money to pay the interest on the obligations of the District and in addition thereto a certain sum to serve as a sinking fund with which to meet the principal when it becomes due, a certain sum year by year to apply upon the principal. Now, that is the "excess" that the gentleman did not understand, or appeared not to understand.

As to the exactness of these figures, I desire to say that we had the actuary of the Treasury make this computation, and it is a mathematically correct computation.

I repeat, then, this appropriation covers the interest for this year on the debt of the District. It also makes provision for a part of the principal. And it tells what shall be done with the sum collected toward the payment of the principal. The committee will understand that the debt of the District consists of 3.65 bonds, 6 per cent and 7 per cent bonds. The 6 and 7 per cent bonds are about extinguished. After this year there will be only 3.65 bonds.

The Treasurer is required to invest the sum raised for the sinking fund for the benefit of the District. The law requires that the sinking fund be invested in the bonds of the District. Hereafter, under existing law, he can invest only in the three-sixty-fives. But the amount of the outstanding indebtedness in that form is limited. It is in the hands of comparatively few people, who know when the Treasurer has some money which must be invested. Suppose they could know that he could invest only in that one thing. What would you do, Mr. Chairman, if you had such a situation before you? What would anyone naturally do who had such bonds? The natural thing to do would be to hold the bonds at a pretty stiff price.

Now, to keep the Treasurer from being imposed on as to the price of the three-sixty-fives, we have given him in this bill the alternative under which he can temporarily invest the sinking-fund part of the money herein appropriated in United States

bonds bearing 2 per cent, the interest of which shall accrue to the sinking fund. When these people who hold the three-sixty-fives find that they can not squeeze the Government they will be more likely to sell the bonds at a fair price. Provision is made, further, that when he can get 3.65 bonds at a price which he deems just and fair to the District he can convert the United States bonds into 3.65 bonds, and set them aside as part of the sinking fund.

I trust the explanation is satisfactory to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be withdrawn. The Chair hears no objection. Without objection, the Chair will direct that the note incorporated on pages 60 and 61 and the top portion of 62 be stricken out. It is no part of the bill. The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For revenue and inspection branch: For water registrar, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$1,800; 2 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; chief inspector, \$936; 8 inspectors, at \$900 each; messenger, \$900.

Mr. PALMER. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an inquiry. These sums are appropriated to be paid wholly from the revenues of the District. I wish to inquire where the money is to come from that you appropriate for the filtration plant.

Mr. McCLEARY. All these items, Mr. Chairman, are payable one-half from the revenues of the District and one-half from the United States Treasury.

Mr. PALMER. About what year of the Christian era do you apprehend this filtration plant will be completed?

Mr. McCLEARY. Next year, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PALMER. According to Colonel Miller it will be a year from next December; that is, in December, 1904.

Now, there was some question raised here last year as to the location of this filtration plant and as to the cost of the land provided for it. It was stated that the land was purchased at a price of \$18,000 an acre out in the neighborhood of the Soldiers' Home. It was suggested that it would have been more economical to go out into the country some place where the land is cheaper to obtain land for this purpose. I observe that the committee had Colonel Miller before them and interrogated him on that subject, and from his testimony it appears that a board of experts recommended that the land for a filtration plant should be bought 8 miles outside of the city.

Now, I would be glad to inquire how it was, when the board of experts recommended that this land be bought outside of the city at probably two or three hundred dollars an acre, that the property was bought within the city limits at \$18,000 an acre, making an expense of over \$600,000?

Mr. McCLEARY. While my friend was reading what he has quoted as being in part what Colonel Miller said, why did not he read the rest of Colonel Miller's statement? The Colonel made quite a full explanation of the matter.

Mr. PALMER. I read the whole of what Colonel Miller said, and I am bound to say that his explanation is not at all satisfactory. He said the reason why they did not buy the ground up toward the falls was because the filtered water running through a pipe might be deteriorated.

Mr. BURKETT. That the filtered water running through a ditch might be deteriorated, and that if we proposed to run it a long distance it would have to be run in an open ditch.

Mr. PALMER. With your filter up 30 miles you would not have to run an open ditch. Moreover, it is far less than 30 miles to the point on the river where the water is taken out.

Mr. BURKETT. It is not 30 miles. He said if he had to pump his filtered water up there he would have to pump the water to get the water into the filter, because filtered water requires to have a head and it would cost more to transport all the supplies, and so on, and all these things were taken into consideration.

Mr. PALMER. Pumping filtered water is no more expensive than pumping the raw water and filtering it after it has been pumped into the filter.

Mr. BURKETT. This thing has been gone over before either the gentleman or I became a member of Congress. It has been settled. Whether it is right or wrong, nobody inquired of the balance that were here five or six years ago.

Mr. PALMER. It seems to me that this filtration plant and buying land for it is under nobody's supervision or control, although I suppose it is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War, and Colonel Miller no doubt is a very intelligent officer detailed by the Secretary to do this work. Now, it seems from the testimony that Colonel Miller has very magnificent ideas—as, for example, he asked \$3,000 to build a tool house at the Great Falls.

Mr. BURKETT. We did not give it to him.



Mr. PALMER. He did not get it; no. Colonel Miller wanted \$3,000 for a house to cover up a scraper, a plow, and a horse; and he wanted \$8,000 for making a survey for a new conduit pipe. You did not give it to him. But I only mentioned it to show the magnificent ideas of Colonel Miller.

I suggest to the committee that they inquire into it and see if there can not be some plan devised by which a filtration plant costing two or three million dollars to the Government can not be built for about what it would cost a private company if engaged in business. These filtration beds are to cost seventy-five or eighty thousand dollars each, and it will take thirty of them to filter this great amount of water—75,000,000 gallons needed, according to Colonel Miller's estimate, to supply Washington. It will run up into enormous figures. I suggest that the next time the committee gets Colonel Miller before them they find out what he is doing, who is making the contract, and who is making the money out of this work, as well as why \$600,000 was paid for land at \$18,000 per acre.

Mr. BURKETT. But he has kept within the estimate all the while.

Mr. PALMER. Yes; but who made the estimate?

Mr. BURKETT. And he has kept within the appropriation.

Mr. PALMER. Colonel Miller made the estimate and made the plans. I attribute nothing wrong to him, but am of the opinion that there should be some other plan adopted to carry on work of such magnitude.

Mr. BURKETT. They were made several years ago.

Mr. PALMER. It makes no difference whether they were made several years ago or several minutes ago. The question is whether the work is costing too much.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out the matter on pages 64 and 65—namely, the notes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that that has already been done by direction of the Chair.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House as amended with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GROSVENOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House bill 16842, making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will submit them in gross to the House. There was no demand for a separate vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McCLEARY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### AN ACT RELATING TO PUBLIC PRINTING.

Mr. HEATWOLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a conference report to be printed under the rule.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill S. 2296, entitled "An act to amend an act approved March 2, 1895, relating to the public printing," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House and agree to the same.

JOEL P. HEATWOLE,

VINCENT BOREING,

F. C. TATE,

Managers on the part of the House.

T. C. PLATT,

S. B. ELKINS,

JAMES K. JONES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

The effect of the accompanying report is to allow to the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate 20 extra copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the use of the Senate.

JOEL P. HEATWOLE,

VINCENT BOREING,

F. C. TATE,

Managers on the part of the House.

#### PHILIPPINE COINAGE BILL.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House No. 383, have had the same under consideration and report the same herewith with an amendment inserting in line 5, after the words "and after," the words "not more than," with the recommendation that as amended the resolution be agreed to.

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this report, it shall be in order to

consider H. R. 15530, entitled "A bill to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands," in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, after five hours' general debate, to be equally divided between the friends and opponents of the bill, it shall be in order to consider it under the five-minute rule, and the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the said bill shall remain privileged until the said bill shall have been reported from the said Committee of the Whole."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule is to call up for consideration the Philippine coinage bill. The rule simply provides that it shall be in order, and limits the general debate to five hours—a length of time which the Committee on Rules was led to understand was agreed upon by the representatives of the two sides. Except in these particulars, the rule makes no change in the conduct of the bill. I understand there is no objection to it.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. LLOYD. What effect will the adoption of the rule have upon the special order for to-morrow, the Alaskan Delegate bill?

Mr. DALZELL. That is a question the Chair will have to determine. I do not feel called upon to take any responsibility upon that matter.

Mr. LLOYD. I would like to inquire of the Chair what will be the effect.

The SPEAKER. The general rule governing such matters is that the order first made shall be the order that will govern the action of the House. The order first made was the one to consider the Alaskan Delegate bill, and the Chair is of opinion that the only method would be by raising the question of consideration. The Chair was unwilling to let the House lose an hour or two this afternoon. We may possibly reach an understanding between this and to-morrow.

Mr. LLOYD. It seems to me there ought to be some understanding in regard to the consideration of these two bills, so that there may be no conflict.

The SPEAKER. There can be no understanding unless the friends of the two measures can reach some agreement. The bill which has been fixed for consideration under the Cushman order, as it is called, will be entitled to consideration to-morrow, unless the question of consideration should be raised and the House should decide against consideration.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this rule is acceptable to both sides of the House. It simply makes this particular bill privileged; and there is no opposition, as I understand, on the part of members of the minority.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I should like exceedingly that in beginning the consideration of an important question like that presented in the pending rule it should be entered upon without the possibility of conflict with any other bill. If an understanding is to be reached, I think we ought to reach it now before the consideration of the bill comes up.

The SPEAKER. The House can not stand still, without proceeding with the business before it, when it has so much to do. The only question now before the House is on the adoption of the proposed rule.

Mr. DALZELL. I do not believe there will be any difficulty in making an arrangement so that both bills will be considered. I presume that the advocates of the Alaska bill will not care whether that bill be considered one or two hours earlier or later. What they want is consideration, and that can be secured.

Mr. LLOYD. I think I can say for the Committee on the Territories that their only desire is that this bill shall not lose its privileged position. So far as I am concerned—the chairman of the committee is not present just now—I am perfectly willing that the consideration of the bill named in the pending resolution should be proceeded with, but I do not wish the other bill to be displaced.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman would be satisfied, then, that we should go ahead with this bill, and that the other bill should follow?

Mr. LLOYD. If our bill is not thereby displaced.

The SPEAKER. The House has already indicated its willingness to have the Alaska bill considered.

Mr. LLOYD. In order to settle the question, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the consideration of the bill named in the resolution the bill providing for a Delegate from Alaska shall be considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] asks unanimous consent that immediately after the disposition of the bill provided for in the pending resolution the order in regard to the Alaska bill shall become operative. Is there objection to this request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is now on the amendment of the Committee on Rules to the proposed resolution.

The amendment was agreed to; and the resolution as amended was adopted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I ask unanimous consent to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to make a personal explanation. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In an editorial in this morning's Post I am credited with the authorship of a quixotic scheme, namely, with the intention of calling the Germans of this country together "to protest"—I follow the language of the editorial—"against the irresponsible utterances of ill feeling toward Germany."

The editorial quotes a Philadelphia paper, and is based, I take it, upon a report emanating from a press agency here, which report, however, I have not seen, and I am, consequently, unable to judge whether and to what extent I have been misrepresented. The mere statement that I myself should have proposed to call such a meeting is a misrepresentation.

The fact is that I have received a number of letters from prominent Americans of German birth and extraction, in which a conference is suggested on Washington's birthday for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that a continuance of the old-time friendship between the United States and the German Empire is near and dear to the heart of every German, ethnologically speaking, in the country, and for the further purpose of protesting against that jingoism which aims at undermining it. While this is a good American purpose—if it is not, it ought to be—I did not encourage the project, and the suggestion that I should act as chairman of such a conference I rejected without a moment's reflection.

The meeting, possibly, will never be held, but if it should take place I shall attend it and tell my friends that the criterion in such matters is not the sporadic press comment but the attitude of the Government itself, and that the attitude of the present Administration during the Venezuela affair, for instance, and on all other occasions, was dignified, conservative, and in pleasing contrast with the jingoism displayed in many public prints.

What my correspondents complain of, and what really prompted them to make the above suggestion, was what I believe to be a syndicate letter, of several columns, published in a number of daily papers, containing a description of an imaginary naval battle between the United States and Germany. That article seemed designed to prepare the public mind for the eventuality of such a war, and one of my constituents wrathfully suggests that "if perfidious Albion had paid for that article, they could not have made a more hellish investment, but the man who wrote it should be tarred and feathered."

In this connection I want to go on record as saying—and I say it with all the earnestness that is within me—that to talk about a war between the United States and Germany is, in my judgment, nothing more nor less than a crime, and in protesting against such talk my correspondents would be backed, as I firmly believe, by enlightened American sentiment. In fact, there ought to be a law to punish those who try to stir up mischief between nations and who violate the sacred injunction of peace, the same as there is a law against disloyalty in war, the former kind of disloyalty being every bit as dangerous as the other, if not more so.

"A friend in time of need is a friend indeed," and the old fatherland was such a friend to us at a very critical period of American history.

Frederick the Great was the true friend of the colonies in the war for independence. He was one of the first to recognize the independence of the colonies, and went so far as to forbid the crossing of his territory by the Hessians, those unfortunate subjects of small greedy rulers who were sold to England to fight the colonies, but the majority of whom, I am happy to say, espoused the cause of liberty and independence as soon as they understood what the war was for.

In the civil war Bismarck was the only friend we had in Europe. From the very first he sided with the defenders of the Union, and at the very time when Gladstone declared in the British Parliament that the South would surely be victorious Bismarck authorized the purchase of Federal bonds by the financiers of Berlin and Frankfurt. This was after we had knocked in vain at the doors of the English as well as the French Governments. There is nothing of this in American schoolbooks; but, nevertheless, these are historical facts which neither this nor any future generation should forget.

In conclusion, I desire to thank the Washington Post for doing me the justice of vouching for my Americanism. My sentiments in that respect, I am happy to state, are those of the vast majority

of American Germans. While they may have been born under another flag, to-day they are nothing unless one and all, heart and soul, Americans, and they have no flag besides "Old Glory."

On some public questions they may entertain opinions differing from those of others, and they may vote nearly as a unit on them. They are opposed to prohibition, because prohibition is impossible and because they believe it to be a humbug, but to think so is their privilege as American citizens. They are against a too radical restriction of immigration, because in fairness they do not want to deny to others the privilege which they themselves enjoyed. They are for sound money, not because they brought their theories from the old country, as some of our friends on the other side erroneously suppose—

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I fail to see anything privileged in a discussion of the financial question. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was given unanimous consent by the House to make a personal explanation.

Mr. BARTHOLDT (continuing). But because of their innate and intelligent conservatism.

They are, one and all, for peace, for the maintenance of amicable relations, a continuance of the traditional friendship between the United States and Germany, and even in this, it seems to me, they occupy good American ground.

But let me say it once for all, peace or war, they are Americans, and their fortunes are linked, like those of every other citizen, to the fortunes of the American Republic, inseparably and forever.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15345. An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 622. An act granting a pension to Dicey Woodall.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1902. An act for the relief of Flora A. Darling.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

H. R. 14478. An act granting an increase of pension to Luman Fuller;

H. R. 11594. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Morrow;

H. R. 14416. An act granting an increase of pension to Alber H. Philips;

H. R. 14957. An act granting an increase of pension to Mathias Custers;

H. R. 15852. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus G. Norton;

H. R. 6326. An act for the relief of Hiram C. Walker;

H. R. 14477. An act granting a pension to John W. Bruff;

H. R. 15206. An act to establish Portal N. Dak., a support of entry and extend thereto the privileges of the first section of the act approved June 10, 1880; and

H. R. 16642. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIX, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 6779. An act to quiet certain land titles in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 6719. An act to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the eastern division of the eastern district of Arkansas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16734) to provide for an American register for the steamer *Beaumont*, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PHILIPPINE COINAGE.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 15520, known as the Philippine coinage bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. TAWNEY in the chair.



The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that, but in connection with that request I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 16657) to extend the coinage system of the United States in the Philippine Islands may be also printed in the RECORD for the information of the House. That is the bill which I shall offer on the part of the minority of the Committee on Insular Affairs as a substitute for the bill now under consideration, at the proper time, and I make this request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 16657 be also printed in the RECORD in connection with the bill H. R. 15520, as presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The Chair will submit both requests together. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bills are as follows:

#### COMMITTEE BILL.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the gold dollar of the United States, consisting of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, as defined by section 3511 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be the standard unit of value in the Philippine Islands; and the lawful money of the United States shall be legal tender in the Philippines for all debts, public and private: *Provided,* That for amounts under 100 pesos the silver currency of said islands authorized by this act shall, when demanded, be paid.

SEC. 2. That in addition to the coinage authorized for use in the Philippine Islands by the act of July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," the government of the Philippine Islands is authorized to coin, for use in said islands, a coin of the denomination of 1 peso, and one of the weight of 416 grains, and the standard of said silver coins shall be such that of 1,000 parts, by weight, 900 shall be of pure metal and 100 of alloy, and the alloy shall be of copper.

SEC. 3. That the Philippine peso authorized by this act and the silver coins issued under authority of the aforesaid act of July 1, 1902, shall be received for all dues to the Government of the Philippine Islands, unless otherwise specifically provided by law, at the rate of 2 pesos for \$1 of the lawful money of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the coinage authorized by this act shall be subject to the conditions and limitations of the provisions of the act of July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," except as herein otherwise provided; and the government of the Philippine Islands may adopt such measures as it may deem proper, not inconsistent with said act of July 1, 1902, to maintain the value of the Philippine peso at the rate of 2 pesos for \$1 of the lawful money of the United States; and in order to maintain such parity between said Philippine pesos and the lawful money of the United States may issue temporary certificates of indebtedness, bearing interest at a reasonable rate, payable at periods of three months or more, but not later than one year from the date of issue, which shall be in the denominations of \$50 or 100 pesos, or some multiple of such sum, and shall be redeemable in gold coin of the United States, or in lawful money of said islands, according to the terms of issue prescribed by the government of said islands; but the amount of such certificates outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

SEC. 5. That the Mexican silver peso now in use in the Philippine Islands, and the silver coins heretofore issued by the Spanish Government for use in said islands, shall be receivable for public dues at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the proclamation of the civil governor of said islands until such date, not earlier than the 31st day of December, 1903, as may be fixed by public proclamation of said civil governor, when such coins shall cease to be so receivable: *Provided,* That the public offices of the government of said islands may at any time refuse to receive such coins which appear to be counterfeit or defective.

SEC. 6. That the treasurer of the Philippine Islands is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to receive deposits of the standard silver coins of 1 peso, authorized by this act to be coined, at the treasury of the government of said islands or any of its branches in sums of not less than 20 pesos, and to issue silver certificates therefor in denominations of not less than 5 pesos, and coin so deposited shall be retained in the treasury and held for the payment of such certificates on demand and used for no other purposes. Such certificates shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and for all public dues in the Philippine Islands, and when so received may be reissued, and when held by any banking association in said islands may be counted as a part of its lawful cash reserve.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Director of the Mint of the United States are hereby authorized and directed, when requested by the government of the Philippine Islands, to make and prepare any drawings, designs, and plates, and execute any coinage, engraving, or printing of notes and certificates authorized by this act, and to make a proper charge for the same, covering as nearly as may be the actual cost, which shall be defrayed from the revenues of said islands.

SEC. 8. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and all provisions of law in force in the Philippine Islands making any form of money legal tender after December 31, 1903, except as provided in this act, are hereby repealed.

#### PROPOSED MINORITY SUBSTITUTE.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the lawful money of the United States shall be legal tender in the Philippine Islands for all debts, public and private, and the coinage laws of the United States are hereby declared to be in full force and effect in the said islands.

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of retiring the silver coinage of the Philippine Islands, and substituting therefor the coins of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to redeem, on presentation in the Philippine Islands, all the Mexican silver pesos now in use in the Philippine Islands, the silver pesos and subsidiary silver coins issued under the authority of the Spanish Government, not including any Mexican silver pesos

that may be imported into the Philippine Islands after the 15th day of March, 1903, at their bullion value, the same to be declared from time to time by the government of the Philippine Islands, and the silver and minor coins authorized by the act of July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," shall be redeemed at the rate of two pesos for \$1 of the lawful money of the United States; and from and after six months from the date when this act shall take effect no coins shall be a legal tender, in the payments of debts thereafter contracted, for any amount, in the Philippine Islands, except the coins of the United States; and whatever sum may be required to carry out the provisions hereof and to pay all expenses that may be incurred in connection therewith is hereby appropriated, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to establish such regulations and employ such agencies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes hereof: *Provided,* That all debts, except those otherwise provided for in the contract, owing on the date when this act shall take effect or contracted within six months thereafter shall be payable in the silver coins now in circulation in the Philippine Islands, or in the lawful money of the United States at the rate of exchange prescribed at the time by the Philippine Commission.

SEC. 3. That the silver coins issued under the authority of the act of July 1, 1902, shall be received for all dues to the government of the Philippine Islands at the rate of 2 pesos for \$1 of the lawful money of the United States and upon such receipt shall not be reissued until recoined into denominations of dollars, halves, quarters, and dimes, of the weight, fineness, and value now fixed for said coins by the coinage laws of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the Mexican silver pesos now in use in the Philippine Islands and the silver coins heretofore issued by the Spanish Government for use in said islands shall be receivable for public dues and in the discharge of all debts, public and private, at their bullion value, to be declared from time to time by the government of the Philippine Islands, until the 1st day of January, 1904, when such coins shall cease to be so receivable for public dues; but such coins shall continue to be so receivable at such rate for the payment of private debts contracted in such money before six months from and after the date this act goes into force and effect, and all of said coins coming into the treasury shall not be reissued as such, but shall be recoined into silver coins of the denominations, weight, fineness, and value now authorized by the coinage laws of the United States.

SEC. 5. That the mint authorized under the act of July 1, 1902, to be established at Manila shall coin American gold and silver coins under the supervision, regulation, and control of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the said mint shall be taken over by the United States Government upon terms agreed upon by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Philippine Commission.

SEC. 6. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act and all regulations, rules, and enactments of the Philippine Commission which may now be in force in the Philippine Islands and inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not differ in principle from the coinage provisions of the Philippine civil government bill which passed the House last June. It proposes that there shall be coined in the Philippines a silver coin to be called a peso and that it shall be received at the ratio of two to one for the United States gold dollar, which gold dollar is to be made the standard of value in the archipelago. There has been in some quarters an entire misapprehension as to the character of the bill. It has been called revolutionary, radical, unusual.

Other adjectives, I may say epithets, have been applied to it of a more or less critical character. The bill is not revolutionary. It is conservative. It does not call for anything in the way of untried experiment. It simply proposes to follow out the policy which England adopted with success in India when she made stable the ratio of the silver rupee with the gold sovereign at 15 to 1; that is, 15 rupees to 1 sovereign, and the rupee to be taken arbitrarily at 16d. It is the same principle which is embodied in the financial legislation of the Netherlands in Java.

The first suggestion for this legislation for the Philippines was in the report of the Taft Philippine Commission in 1900, their first report. Governor Taft, in testifying before the Committee on Insular Affairs, said that—

What the Commission were anxious to bring about, if possible, was a suspension of the fluctuations of the value of the silver dollar, from which bankers were the only persons who seemed to make any profit.

On the other hand—

I read from his testimony—

we were exceedingly anxious not to disturb the coinage as it now exists in the islands among the Filipinos.

I mean this, that we are exceedingly anxious not to disturb the values of oriental peoples; and the Filipinos, who do not differ from other oriental peoples in that respect, have a great regard for traditions and names. Therefore we thought if we could devise a system by which the standard could be as little subject to fluctuation as possible—that is, it should be a gold standard and at the same time have a silver coinage so near to the present silver coinage as to not make any difference by reason of names in the minds of the people—that that would be the best coinage to adopt.

The committee will observe that that is a very conservative suggestion, not to change the names and appearance and size of the coins now in use among the people generally throughout the archipelago, and he follows it up with this statement:

I am very certain that to attempt to adopt as a whole the coinage of the United States in those islands would be productive of nothing but disaster.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the bill which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], a few minutes ago, announced that he should offer to-morrow as a substitute for the pending measure, I desire again to call the attention of gentlemen, and especially of gentlemen upon the opposite side of the House, to the concluding sentence which I have just read:

I am very certain that to attempt to adopt as a whole the coinage of the United States in those islands would be productive of nothing but disaster.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire when that statement was made?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That statement was made last spring, but I have a recent letter from Governor Taft, and more than one, in which he reiterates that sentiment. Here is what he said in a letter to me which I received the latter part of October:

Since I have found the difficulties that present themselves in all business and industrial relations in these islands due to the fluctuations in silver, I am convinced that the enactment into law of the House plan for a gold standard in these islands is second in importance only to the provision for a legislative assembly.

He has written a letter since that time in which he corroborates that, and in even stronger language.

The War Department, soon after this report of the Philippine Commission in 1900, sent to the islands Mr. Charles A. Conant, who, as the committee well knows, is one of the world's foremost gold-standard advocates, a man who has written books on the subject of coinage and of banking, a recognized authority in finance the world around, now connected with the Morton Trust Company of the city of New York.

He went to the archipelago, and, as I said last summer, I inferred from conversations which I had with him that he went there predisposed to favor the enactment for the Philippines of a coinage law similar to that of the United States of America. He came back and reported to the War Department, in an exceptionally able document, his entire accordance with the suggestions of the Philippine Commission for the coinage of a Philippine peso, the ratio of which was to be made stable at 2 to 1 with the gold dollar of the United States.

Not only do the Philippine Commission and Mr. Conant favor the plan which is embodied in the pending bill, but Lyman J. Gage, when Secretary of the Treasury, cordially approved it. In Appendix F to the report of the Secretary of War in 1900 is a note by the then Secretary of the Treasury, Lyman J. Gage, in which he says, after speaking of the bad financial system in the islands:

The evident cure is to establish their domestic money in a fixed relation to the world's money, or what might better be called the selling-house standard, London or New York. Can this be done? Probably it can. How? By following, in a modified way, what is now in vogue in the United States—that is to say, let the island government, or our own Government, as may be thought the wiser, buy silver bullion and coin 412½ grains, nine-tenths fine, into pesos or Filipino dollars. Pay them out for all goods bought or service rendered, at the ratio of 2 silver pesos to \$1 of gold, and redeem them from the holder at the same ratio, namely, \$1 in gold for 2 silver pesos (or Filipino dollars). At the present price of silver bullion there would be a nominal profit of about 5 per cent to the Government in thus buying bullion and coining money.

The Secretary then declares that there are two possible objections to this plan. After analyzing these, he says:

These two objections, however, are more nominal than real, because they would tend to be self-corrective. \* \* \* It seems imperatively necessary to open the way to an increased supply of the circulating medium there. No method seems to be so direct and immediate as to reopen the mint at Manila for the coinage of silver under the conditions and limitations above set forth, or, as an alternative, to the unlimited coinage of pesos, or dollars, of about the weight and fineness of the Mexicans, for the public. \* \* \* One or the other of the courses pointed out ought to be adopted. In my opinion, the method first above described is greatly to be preferred.

In other words Secretary Gage "greatly prefers" the plan proposed in the bill now under consideration.

We have increased the number of grains in the peso from 412½, which was the number proposed in the House bill of last Spring, to 416, because of the subsequent decline in the value of silver bullion, it having gone down approximately 30 per cent. The idea all the time of course has been to have this practically a token coin. Its limitation in coinage and the fact that it is to be received for public dues and for private debts will hold it at par, as, under similar conditions, have the silver dollar in this country, the silver thaler in the Netherlands, and the rupee in India.

We had before the Committee on Insular Affairs Henry W. Peabody, a business man of wide repute, the head of a great commercial house in Boston which has establishments in Boston, New York, London, Manila, Yucatan, South Africa, and all around the world. He strongly indorsed the plan proposed by the pending bill, except that he thought it would be better, as a matter of practical detail, to have the standard of value a gold peso of half the value of our gold dollar. That is, he would cut the gold dollar in two, call one of these halves a Philippine gold peso, and then have the ratio between it and the Philippine silver peso 1 to 1.

This question was asked him:

Your proposed amendment would amount to nothing more than a matter of practical detail; it would not change essentially the principle of the pending bill?

Mr. PEABODY. The principle of the bill and most of the provisions of the bill would be unchanged.

This man, of wide business experience, and perfectly familiar with business conditions in the Philippine Islands, was asked whether the Philippine government could maintain the parity of

the coins as provided by the bill. This is the question propounded to him:

Do you believe that the resources of the government are such that it can without much difficulty maintain the gold standard?

To which he replied:

There would be no difficulty in doing so, because there would be something like 35 per cent cost of silver that is gold redemption.

You mean seigniorage?

Mr. PEABODY. Yes; that would suffice to make what most people would call an ample redemption fund.

Aside from this distinguished authority, we have the report of Professor Jenks, who was sent as an expert to the Orient to study and report on financial conditions there. He visited the Orient, made an exhaustive study of the situation in the Philippines, the Straits Settlements, in Java and India, and in a report to the Secretary of War last fall indorsed the coinage plan proposed in this bill as the one best adapted to the Philippine Islands. After enumerating the different reasons which have led him to his conclusions, he says:

For all these reasons, therefore, it seems on the whole best that the Filipinos be given a fixed rate of exchange for their currency as compared with the gold standard of the United States.

Then he adds a statement which is of great significance, gentlemen of the committee—especially so because of the announcement made here a short time since by the gentleman from Virginia that he would offer as a substitute a bill providing for the United States coinage system complete in the islands.

It is, however, desirable, whenever any country is to establish a new system of currency, that the value of the coins most common in circulation be changed as little as possible.

Now let us stop right there. How much does the pending bill propose to change the value of the Philippine silver coins now in use? How much would the substitute bill of the gentleman from Virginia change the value of these coins? We propose a silver peso of the size now in use, which shall be equivalent to 50 cents in gold. To-day its bullion value is about 37 cents—a margin of 13 to 14 cents. The gentleman from Virginia would have a silver dollar smaller in size than the coin now in use, but which shall be equivalent to 100 cents in gold, although its bullion value would be 36 or 37 cents—a margin of 63 to 64 cents.

Professor Jenks says that it would be unwise abruptly to make a change like that in the coinage of any people and especially of an oriental people.

The wages of labor and prices already fixed are to a considerable extent matters of custom. If a monetary unit is introduced of considerably more value than the one abandoned, it will be necessary to make a nominal reduction of wages and prices. The consequence is that laborers and less well-informed sellers of produce will feel that their income is being arbitrarily lessened and great dissatisfaction is almost certain to be the result. One can easily see how a sudden action of that kind on the part of a government might produce even a revolution among people not well informed on monetary matters.

Governor Taft testified that, in his opinion, the arbitrary introduction of the American coinage system into the archipelago would result in nothing but disaster. And Professor Jenks in effect strongly indorses this view. He says:

One can easily see how a sudden action of that kind (the introduction of a monetary unit of high value) on the part of the government might produce even a revolution among people not well informed on monetary matters.

He then makes his recommendations:

It seems, therefore, the wisest plan for the United States, if it intends to act in the interest of the native Filipinos and not exclusively for the interest of a comparatively few exporters and bankers, to adopt the gold standard and adopt the system of coinage recommended, which will produce as little disturbance as any that has been proposed. It is extremely unfortunate that the system could not have been adopted before the last fall in silver, as in that case there would have been no disturbance that would have been noticed.

The professor said in his report, as we all know, that the government of India made stable the ratio between the silver rupee and the gold sovereign at 15 to 1, and that it has maintained the ratio without trouble since. He says that in 1900 the demand for the rupees in India became stronger than ever before, so that the government, after purchasing all the silver it could, telegraphed to London to buy and send out more silver. The prophecy was made, when India proposed to go on a gold standard that fixed a ratio between the rupee and the sovereign, that there would be a dearth of gold and that the treasury would be drained of that metal. But the professor says that on the contrary the demand was for more silver instead of for more gold.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. The gentleman states in the report that silver depreciated 30 per cent last year. Now, the American dollar and the India rupee depreciated to a larger extent. How can the gentleman by legislative fiat, or by legislative command, make a certain standard? Will he alter it or stop the fluctuation?



Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman forgets an acknowledged law of monetary science, that a limited coinage of a token coin, which coin is received for public dues and for private debts, will hold it at par. It is the unlimited coinage of a token coin which leads to the fluctuation. For example, our silver dollar here has never been redeemable, at least up to 1900, nor has it ever been at a discount. Why? Because subsequent to 1873 we have not had free coinage, and the supply has not gone beyond the demand. The limited coinage of the silver dollar, the fact that it is received for debts, public and private, and that it is legal tender have held it at par.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. The gentleman knows that that was largely due to the intelligence of the American people. Will the same principle prevail among the Filipinos? Will they take the coin at a double ratio? It has worked in the United States, but it does not work in India with the rupee, and it will not work in the Philippines.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What does the gentleman mean by saying that it does not work in India, when every witness that has been before our committee, when questioned on the subject, says that it does work? Has the gentleman been in India—has he any foundation for his assertion?

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. I think it has caused trouble at different times.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There was at the outset a slight difficulty, but it passed away. It was but temporary. Since that time there has been no difficulty whatever. The treasury has been filled with gold and the rupee has circulated at the ratio mentioned.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman think it entirely fair to quote the example of India? India found herself in the position of a silver-standard country and had to make the best of conditions. It stopped the coinage and is now trying by exchangeability to maintain the parity of the two methods. But the silver circulation of India to-day is \$1.58 per capita and of the United States \$8.50, and this bill on the House side authorizes an unlimited coinage and on the Senate side a per capita coinage of over \$12. There is the difference between your illustration and the facts.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Connecticut is entirely mistaken if he supposes there is to be unlimited coinage.

Mr. HILL. Is there any limit in the bill?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is left entirely with the government there, just as it is in India.

Mr. HILL. Is not that unlimited coinage?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman suppose that the government out there is going to enter upon unlimited coinage?

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman suppose that any government that ever issued fiat paper money intended to go beyond the possibility of redemption? And yet there has never been a case in the history of the world where a country entering upon that policy did not exceed the limit and go beyond the possibility of redemption.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is making statements which strike me as unfounded in fact. At least I have been unable to find a solitary authority—and I have read everything obtainable on the subject—which substantiates what the gentleman has said. Here I have the statement of Professor Jenks, the last expert who went there and studied this question, in which he says:

While there is no strong demand for gold for circulation in India, the government seems to have succeeded in establishing a gold basis for the currency, and in maintaining without serious difficulty a fixed rate of exchange.

He says further:

According to the opinion of both business men and bankers in India, the fixing of a rate of exchange has lessened the opportunity of the bankers for gains from their exchange business.

Later in his report he says, speaking of Netherlands-India:

Although the standard is a gold standard, and although the exchange has been kept substantially fixed throughout the entire period of the relative fall in the price of silver, gold is practically not at all in circulation in Netherlands-India.

That seems to be the case also in India. In Java the bank holds a large reserve of gold, but it is not paid out on demand. By reason of the limitation in coinage, and of the fact that the coin is received for public dues and private debts and that it is a token coin, it has been kept at par.

The silver dollar of the United States, of which there are hundreds of millions, has always floated at par. The bullion in it has run down so as to be worth less than 40 cents, yet it passes everywhere current as a dollar. It is received for public dues and private debts. The limitation in the coinage, the uses to which it can be put, and the demand for it keep the token coin at par. That is the rule of finance which is not denied.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the gentleman this question: If he

were starting out with a new financial system in the United States, would he adopt a system which included six hundred millions of full legal-tender silver dollars as an initiatory step?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Other things being equal I would not presume that I knew more about what ought to be done for the Philippine Islands than does the Taft Commission; than does Professor Jenks, who went upon the ground and studied the subject; than does Charles A. Conant, one of the foremost gold advocates of the world. I would not think that I, so far away, was as competent as those men to judge of what ought to be done in the Philippines, especially where their opinion is corroborated by so distinguished a financier as Lyman J. Gage, and by the experience of the government of India, which has adopted this system; and by the Netherlands, which has established it in Java.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman think that is an answer to my question, whether, if he were initiating a new system of finance in the United States he would start out with six hundred millions of legal tender silver dollars?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You ask me to answer a question which is not germane to the issue now in hand; which, in my judgment, has no relevancy whatever.

Mr. HILL. Is it not germane in this respect: You are proposing to provide a new system of finance for an archipelago 7,000 miles away, not nearly so strong financially as the United States, and are proposing to give it a system which you would not establish in the United States if you could.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would establish it in the United States if this country were situated similarly to the Philippine Archipelago.

Mr. HILL. Suppose there were precisely as good authorities on the other side?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have not been able to find them.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps you will before you get through with this debate.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I alluded by way of illustration to the history of the silver dollar in the United States, saying that it has been kept at par simply because the coinage has been limited and the dollar can be used for the purposes I have mentioned. Now, let me say that the United States Treasury Department has issued a pamphlet (circular No. 113) giving "information concerning United States bonds, paper currency, coin," etc., in which I find this statement on page 18:

Gold coins and standard silver dollars, being standard coins of the United States, are not redeemable.

Here we have the Treasury of the United States, in the year 1900, notifying the world that the silver dollars of the United States are not redeemable. Yet, although the bullion in them was worth but from 40 to 50 cents, they passed current for 100 cents. Why? Because of the indisputable law of finance that a limited coinage of a token coin, if you give that coin the uses I have mentioned, will float at par. Such is the history of finance everywhere. Here we have the Treasury of the United States notifying the world, four years after the great campaign of 1896, that silver dollars were not redeemable; that if you brought them to the Treasury the Department reserved the option of giving you gold or not.

Mr. HILL. I should dislike very much indeed to have the statement go out to the country, and especially to the world, that the United States silver dollar is not redeemable. The Treasury Department since the passage of the gold-standard act of March 14, 1900, has held and holds to-day that it is in duty bound to exchange gold for silver or silver for gold, and is doing it every day and has been doing it since 1900, notwithstanding there is no specific law to that effect.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Permit me to ask the gentleman from Connecticut this question: Prior to the law of 1900, which the gentleman has just mentioned, were the silver dollars at a discount?

Mr. HILL. In my judgment, prior to the law of 1900—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Were they at a discount?

Mr. HILL. The Treasury Department was in duty bound under the parity clause of the Sherman Act to exchange silver dollars for gold; and it was the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury in 1893, that if called upon to redeem the paper of the United States he would redeem it, not in gold, but in silver, that helped to bring on the panic.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Nevertheless in 1900 the Treasury Department of the United States in an official document, which I hold in my hand, says, "The silver dollars of the United States are not redeemable;" and prior to 1900 there were hundreds of millions of those dollars in circulation in the United States, all at par. What kept them at par? The undeniable rule of finance which I have mentioned and apparently can not repeat too often, that a token silver coin of limited coinage, an unlimited tender for private debts and receivable for public dues, keeps at par with

gold. It is the rule in India; it is the rule in the United States; it is the rule in the Netherlands.

I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. TAWNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15520, the Philippine coinage bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an appropriation for a tidal indicator in the Maritime Exchange, New York City—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting petition of Emilio Aguinaldo y Famy asking legislation for the establishment of an agricultural bank in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16697) granting a pension to Ellen Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3174); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16499) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Wainwright, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3175); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5511) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus V. Gorrell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3176); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15358) granting a pension to John Snodgrass, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3177); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15617) granting an increase of pension to William Keith, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3178); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16344) for the relief of Lucinda Lawrence, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3179); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5280) granting a pension to Dollie Cosens, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3180); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5244) granting an increase of pension to William H. Maxwell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3181); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 252) granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Peddycoard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3182); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6155) granting an increase of pension to William Markle, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3183); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6361) granting a pension to Emma Dean Powell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3184); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16591) granting an increase of pension to James Mattingly, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3185); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16358) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Walker, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3186); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16512) granting an increase of pension to John Dinneen, alias John J. Davidson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3187); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15438) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Peabody, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3188); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15585) granting an increase of pension to Solomon S. Shaner, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3189); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16058) granting a pension to John Corbett, minor heir of John Corbett, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3190); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16522) for the relief of Caleb C. Van Sickell, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3191); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15437) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Gerry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3192); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16492) granting a pension to Wilson G. Gray, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3193); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16269) granting a pension to Annie W. Coit, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3194); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15443) granting a pension to Endora Wells, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3195); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15438) granting a pension to Lucinda J. Pratt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3196); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16371) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus W. Peabody, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3197); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15733) granting an increase of pension to M. G. Cole, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3198); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14475) granting an increase of pension to David E. Lawton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3199); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6670) granting a pension to Hercules H. Price, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3200); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.



Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12411) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bart, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3291); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13316) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Olcott, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3202); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12991) granting a pension to Gustavus S. Perkins, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3203); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11682) granting a pension to Mary E. Winterbottom, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3204); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5281) granting a pension to P. H. Mahan, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3205); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12492) granting an increase of pension to Callie West, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3206); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11616) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Harris, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3207); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8812) granting an increase of pension to Henry Staff, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3208); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10175) granting a pension to Mary R. Bagley, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3209); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7895) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Bowen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3210); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4632) granting an increase of pension to William P. Rhodes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3211); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7844) granting a pension to Alonzo Pendland, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3212); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5898) granting an increase of pension to Reuben F. Carter, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3213); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5010) granting an increase of pension to James W. Pace, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3214); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3569) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Buckholz, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3215); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2614) granting a pension to John Sullivan, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3216); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1644) granting an increase of pension to L. P. Bryant, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3217); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1024) granting a pension to James R. Ward, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3218); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2473) granting an increase of pension to James Billingsley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3219); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4059) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Cook, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3220); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4515) granting an increase of pension to Alfred O. Blood, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3221); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2084) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Ewing, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3222); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3250) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Piety, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3223); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3298) granting an increase of pension to William A. Kimball, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3224); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4401) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Kropf, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3225); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3730) granting an increase of pension to Jonas Olmstead, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3226); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1903) granting an increase of pension to Hamline B. Williams, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3227); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1614) granting an increase of pension to Nelson W. Carlton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3228); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3970) granting an increase of pension to Mary Elizabeth Fales, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3229); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5976) granting an increase of pension to Milton Frazier, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3230); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1482) granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3231); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3752) granting a pension to John E. Pichard, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3232); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3353) granting an increase of pension to John Kehn, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3233); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1016) granting a pension to Charles S. F. Hilton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3234); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which

was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12053) granting an increase of pension to Franklin T. Miller, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3235); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13881) granting a pension to W. M. Wilson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3236); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13088) granting an increase of pension to Hiram D. Deming, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3237); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2987) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Rittenhouse, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3238); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2136) for the relief of Lawrence H. Rousseau, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3239); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 659) increasing the pension of Winfield Pierce, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3240); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10355) granting an increase of pension to William W. Smithson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3241); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8617) granting a pension to Sabina Lally, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3242); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9072) granting an increase of pension to George W. Steffey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3243); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10869) granting an increase of pension to Michael K. Strayer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3244); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15889) granting an increase of pension to Chester A. Abbott, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3245); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15670) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Richardson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3246); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15387) granting an increase of pension to Lot Van Nordstrand, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3247); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14758) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Talbott, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3248); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16465) granting an increase of pension to William H. Knepple, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3249); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. APLIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16272) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Dodd, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3250); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16534) granting an increase of pension to James H. Durham, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3251); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15186) granting

an increase of pension to Isaac J. Nichols, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3252); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6526) granting an increase of pension to Orin T. Fall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3253); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3504) granting a pension to Grace Ashton Negley, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3254); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5643) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3255); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3940) granting an increase of pension to Eliza C. Deery, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3256); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3773) granting an increase of pension to Leroy Roberts, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3257); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5355) granting an increase of pension to George A. King, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3258); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11379) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Long, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture: A bill (H. R. 16910) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. DICK: A bill (H. R. 16911) providing for the expenditure of money hitherto appropriated for the improvement and maintenance of Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 16912) for the disposition of school lands in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 16913) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office at Goldsboro, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 16914) to prevent combinations of corporations engaged in interstate or foreign commerce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY: A bill (H. R. 16915) authorizing the commissioners' court of Escambia County, Ala., to construct a bridge across Conecuh River at or near a point known as McGowans Ferry, in said county and State—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GLENN: A resolution (H. Res. 400) for the consideration of S. 6502, relating to ceded lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. APLIN: A bill (H. R. 16916) granting an increase of pension to Isaac D. Toll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 16917) granting an increase of pension to Milton B. Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16918) granting an increase of pension to S. E. Lemon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 16919) granting an honorable discharge to William H. H. Thompson, late acting master's mate, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.



By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 16920) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 16921) granting an increase of pension to Milton C. Dunbar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16922) granting an increase of pension to George E. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16923) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Tompkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16924) for the relief of Edna Mabel Eldridge—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 16925) granting an increase of pension to John A. Sherwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A bill (H. R. 16926) granting a pension to Benjamin P. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 16927) for the relief of the widow and children of Henry C. Murphy, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 16928) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 16929) granting an increase of pension to William H. Trites—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 16930) granting a pension to Josephine Drinkwater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16931) granting an increase of pension to James P. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16932) granting an increase of pension to Alfred A. Burrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHEA: A bill (H. R. 16933) for the relief of G. W. Dunford and James Blair, sureties of S. C. Bralley, late postmaster at Redbluff, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 16934) to remove the charge of disobedience of orders against William W. Kirby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 16935) granting a pension to John Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16936) granting a pension to Phoebe Tilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16937) granting an increase of pension to Calvin W. Birg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16938) granting an increase of pension to Granville E. Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16939) granting an increase of pension to Alexander T. Sullenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 16940) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Kincaid—to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. APLIN: Circular relating to and favoring the semicentennial anniversary of building the first ship canal between Lake Huron and Lake Superior at St. Marys Falls—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of retail druggists of East Tawas and Rogers, Mich., for a reduction on the tax on alcohol to 70 cents per proof gallon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolutions of Metal Trades Association and Business Men's Club, of Cincinnati, Ohio, concerning joint resolution 220—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of Manufacturers' Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill 3076—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Alexander Fries & Brother and others, of Cincinnati, urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BULL: Resolution of the Rhode Island Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, protesting against the passage of the bill to amend the Revised Statutes relating to the transportation of live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest of the same society, against the passage of House bill 15991—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Newport, R. I., in favor of the passage of the anti-injunction bill and the prison-labor bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolutions of Local Union No. 176, Brotherhood of Car-

penters and Joiners, Newport, R. I., favoring the repeal of the desert-land and homestead-commutation acts—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of H. S. Schwake and other citizens of Nebraska City and George Barbee, of Syracuse, Nebr., urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of the Rhode Island Automobile Club, in favor of the bill to create a bureau of public roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of D. C. Stott & Co. and others, of Westerly, R. I., and D. B. Griffin and other druggists of Rhode Island, urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. W. Ashton Thompson, of Woonsocket, R. I., in favor of the passage of House bill 16503, relating to Army chaplains—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, protesting against the passage of the bill to amend the Revised Statutes relative to the transportation of live stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Local Union No. 176, of Newport, R. I., Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Petitions of citizens of Orrville, Ohio, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Ohio Horse Breeders' Association, urging the passage of House bill 16656, for the free importation of pure-bred live stock for breeding purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of Prairie Grove quarterly meeting of Friends, Marietta, Iowa, against the repeal of the anti-canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CREAMER: Petition of Fully Disabled Union Veterans of Brooklyn, N. Y., asking for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to John F. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of Ira M. Hawkins and other citizens of New York, favoring antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of retail druggists of Galesville, Wis., for a reduction of the tax on alcohol to 70 cents per proof gallon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Flinn Post, No. 77, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wisconsin, indorsing House bill 15456, providing for the establishment of a branch soldiers' home in Florida—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Local Union No. 3, International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance, of Blue Island, Ill., for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Brown Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church, Allegheny, Pa., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolution of the American Protective Tariff League, in relation to reciprocity—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of Rebecca J. Tompkins for restoration of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Edna Mabel Eldridge—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of William Burke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of S. Alexander and others of South Norwalk, Conn., concerning immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULL: Protest of Seattle Federation of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Seattle, Wash., to prohibit liquor selling in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. JOY: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: Petition of citizens of Louisville, Ky., for the improvement of the Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KERN: Resolutions of Federal Labor Union No. 7087, Federation of Labor, of Belleville, Ill., for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, papers to accompany bill for a pension to Mrs. Susan Lasley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Protest of Long Island Lodge, No. 232, order of B'rith Abraham, Brooklyn, N. Y., against the exclusion of Jewish immigrants at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Josephine Drinkwater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Paper to accompany bill for a pension to Charles E. Mahew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of community of Hiwassee College, Tenn., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Sarah Crabtree, of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying reference of war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of T. J. Townsend, pastor of Baptist Church at Decherd, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of J. J. Hosemueller and others, favoring House bill 178—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Deems & Raber, of Laud, Ind., urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWANN: Papers to accompany House bill 16903, granting a pension to Susan J. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Papers to accompany House bill for increase of pension to A. T. Sullenger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for increase of pension of Granville E. Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Calvin W. Birg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5763 granting a pension to Anna Beauchamp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 21, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. ELKINS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Comptroller of the Currency calling attention to the language in section 2, page 9, of the bill to establish the department of commerce and labor in regard to the methods of accounting by the proposed new department, and suggesting a substitute therefor in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 31, 1894; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

### AGRICULTURAL BANK IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting the petition of Emilio Aguinaldo y Famy, formerly leader of the Philippine insurrection, praying for the enactment of legislation for the establishment of an agricultural bank in the Philippine Islands; which, with the accompanying petition, was referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the First National Bank, of Hoquiam, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a revision of the banking and currency laws; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 44, American Federation of Labor, of Spokane, Wash., praying for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association, of Seattle, Wash., American Federation of Labor, of Seattle, Wash., and a petition of Central Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of Whatcom, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Columbia, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Gov-

ernment buildings and grounds; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Columbia, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in United States immigrant stations; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the internal-revenue laws so as to reduce the tax on distilled spirits; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of the Carriage and Wagon Workers' Local Union of San Francisco; of Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union No. 120, of Stockton; of the Metal Polishers, Buffers, Brass Molders, and Brass Workers' Local Union of San Francisco; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 304, of San Francisco; of Local Union No. 152, of San Francisco; of Local Union No. 68, of San Francisco; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 469, of Bakersfield; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 981, of Petaluma, and of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 483, of San Francisco, all of the American Federation of Labor, and of Lodge No. 73, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Golden West, all in the State of California, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a telegram which I have just received from sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., in opposition to the placing of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the control of and within the department to be designated the department of commerce and labor. I ask that the telegram may be read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

[Telegram.]

CHICAGO, Ill., January 20, 1903.

Hon. SHELBY M. CULLOM,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following preamble and resolutions were adopted this day by the directors of the Chicago Board of Trade:

Whereas it is proposed to place the Interstate Commerce Commission under the control and within a department to be designated the "department of commerce and labor;" and

Whereas by the act of 1887 to regulate commerce it is specifically provided that the said Commission be nonpartisan; and

Whereas to include the said Commission within the proposed new department would place a purely executive duty upon a commission principally engaged in exercising semijudicial authority; and

Whereas the object of the act to regulate commerce is not so much to promote commerce as it is to regulate and control its chief instrumentality, viz, transportation; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission was originally under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department and was removed from the Department by reason of the recommendations of at least two of its Secretaries:

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago respectfully and earnestly protest against merging the Interstate Commerce Commission within the proposed department of commerce and labor.

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be telegraphed to President Roosevelt and Senators NELSON, ELKINS, CULLOM, and MASON, and to Representatives HEPBURN and MANN.

R. G. CHANDLER, President.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Morris; of Federal Labor Union No. 7241, of Dundee; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 41, of Aurora; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 394, of Sycamore, and of Local Union No. 85, of Kensington, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented the petition of Marshall Field and sundry other citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the establishment of a naval office in connection with the customs-house at the port of Chicago; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 375, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago; of Lodge No. 4, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago; of Local Union No. 703, of Ridge Prairie; of Cigarmakers' Local Union No. 80, of Danville; of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 178, of Peoria; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 1338, of Utica; of Cigarmakers' Local Union No. 41, of Aurora; of the Tri-City Labor Congress of Rock Island, and of Local Union No. 41, of Catlin, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and a petition of Miners' Union No. 68, of Galena, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a memorial of the Lumbermen's Club of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the legislative board of the Friends' Church of America, praying for the adoption of an